

THE  
SLAVONIC  
(AND EAST EUROPEAN)  
REVIEW

A Survey of the Slavonic Peoples,  
Their History, Economics, Philology and Literature

VOLUME SEVENTEEN

Printed in Great Britain by  
Eyre and Spottiswoode Limited  
East Harding Street, E.C.4



EDITORS ·

BERNARD PARES, R. W. SETON-WATSON, WILLIAM J. ROS

AMERICAN CONTRIBUTING EDITORS

SAMUEL N. HARPER, ROBERT J. KERNER, GEORGE R. NOYE

LIST OF CONTRIBUTORS.

---

ATFRIDGE, R. T.

BURTSKY, VLADIMIR

CHERNAVIN, T.

CHYZ, YAROSLAV J.

COLEMAN, A. P.

CZACHOWSKI, KAZIMIERZ

DYBOSKI, ROMAN.

GUSTAINIS, VALENTINE

JACHIMECKI, ZDISLAW.

KAUN, ALEX.

KING, BEATRICE.

KLANČAR, ANTHONY J.

KOSÁRY, DOMINIC.

KŘIVÝ, MIROSLAV.

LAWTHER, M.

LOZOVINA, VINKO.

LYALL, ARCHIBALD.

MACHÁČEK, FRIDOLÍN

MENCZFR, BÉLA.

MILYUKOV, PAUL.

MORISON, W. A.

NOYES, G. R.

PARES, BERNARD.

PEACOCK, MARJORIE B.

POSTNIKOV, S.

RADIN, DOROTHEA PRALL.

RIPKA, HUBERT.

ROSE, W. J.

ROUČEK, JOSEPH S.

SEGAL, LOUIS.

SILVER, PAUL

SETON-WATSON, R. W.

SEWELL-GRANT, H. C.

SIKORSKI, WŁADYSŁAW.

SHMURLO, E.

SIMMONS, ERNEST J.

SMOGORZEWSKI, K.

STRUVE, GLEB.

SZENCZI, N. J.

SUMNER, B. H.

TAIT, DOROTHY F.

TURTON, GODFREY.

WALPOLE, HUGH.

WALSHE, M. O'C.

WELLEK, RENÉ

WHARTON, L. E.

WISH, HARVEY.

YAKOBSON, SERGIUS.

YERAS, SIDONIE.

# CONTENTS.

	PAGE
Czechoslovakia—the Key to the Danube Basin . . . . .	By HUBERT
RIPKA . . . . .	51
The Sokol Movement . . . . .	By FRIDOLÍN MACHÁČEK . . . . .
	73
"The Elders of Sion" a Proved Forgery. By VLADIMÍR	
BURTSEV . . . . .	91
Poland, Foreign Relations (II). By K. SMOGORZEWSKI . . . . .	105
The Last Plea of Bukharin . . . . .	121
Soviet Education. By BEATRICE KING . . . . .	135
Soviet History (III). By B. H. SUMNER . . . . .	151
Gabriel Bethlen: Transylvania in 17th Century. By DOMINIC	
KOSÁRY . . . . .	162
Karol Szymanowski. By ZDISŁAW JACHIMECZKI . . . . .	174
J. E. Purkyně: Czech Scientist and Patriot . . . . .	By MIROSLAV
KŘIVÝ . . . . .	186
English Translations of Eugene Onegin. By ERNEST J. SIMMONS . . . . .	198
Edward Beneš. By PAUL MILYUKOV . . . . .	207
President Beneš's Broadcast to the Nation . . . . .	223
Twenty Years of Czech Literature (1918-38). By RENE WELTER . . . . .	320
Poland's Defences. By WŁADYSŁAW SIKORSKI . . . . .	343
Separatist Tendencies Among the Russian Emigrés. By S.	
POSTNIKOV . . . . .	350
The Origins of the School of Slavonic Studies. By R. W. SEaton-	
WATSON . . . . .	360
Slavonic Studies in the United States (1918-38). By A. P.	
COLEMAN . . . . .	372
Anglo-Soviet Relations during Labour's First Ministry. By	
HARVEY WISH . . . . .	380
The Making of Modern Slovenia. By ARCHIBALD LYALL . . . . .	404
Slavonic Cities. Warsaw. By WILLIAM J. ROSE . . . . .	416
Maxim Gorky: In Search of a Synthesis. By ALEXANDER KAUN . . . . .	420
Current Russian Literature—VII. Boris Žaytsev. By GIEB	
STRUVE . . . . .	445
Joseph Eötvös and Hungarian Liberalism. By BÉLA MENCZER . . . . .	522
Metternich and Internal Austrian Policy—I. By R. W. SEaton-	
WATSON . . . . .	530
Britain and the Hungarian War of Independence. By N. J.	
SZENCZI . . . . .	550
A State of Hostilities Exists. By "FAR EAST" . . . . .	571

Russians in the U. S. By Y. J. CHYZ and JOSEPH S. ROUČEK ...	638
The Home of the Last Tsar By T. CIFRNAVIN ...	659
Gundulić, the Poet of the Ragusan Republic By VINKO LOZOVINA	669
Roztworowski Polish Tragic Dramatist By K. CZACHOWSKI	677

Mother Máčik Goes to the Polls From Slovak of J. C. HRONSKÝ	21
I Know Now, Mother From the Slovene of IVAN CANKAR	35
Simple Martin From the Slovene of IVAN CANKAR ..	38
Three Sketches From the Russian of P. ROMANOV ..	41
The Death of Khan Krum From the Bulgarian of A. KARALIV-CHIKVA ..	264
The Mystic Rose From the Polish of EWA ŁUSKINA ..	272
The Arakush From the Russian of S. N. SERGEYEV-TSENSKY	282
Buryga From the Russian of LEONID LEONOV ..	502
A Sea Change From the Roumanian of I. A. BRĂTESCU-VOINĂȘII ..	520
The Other World From the Bulgarian of "ELIN-PELIN" ..	522

## POETRY.

The Lilies From the Polish of MICKIEWICZ ... ..	I
Twardowski's Wife From the Polish of MICKIEWICZ . .	11
Religious Poems From the Polish of MICKIEWICZ ... ..	15
The Review of the Army From the Polish of MICKIEWICZ ...	249
Verses from the Russian of PUSHKIN and FET ... ..	263
After Munich From the Czech ... ..	489
Day Before the Flood in St. Petersburg From the Polish of MICKIEWICZ ... ..	490
Ballad of Michael the Dragon and Korun the Kessedjia. Bulgarian Ballad ... ..	497

Obituary .. ..	209, 689
Soviet Legislation ... ..	219, 452, 697
Russian Chronicle . . . .	227, 465, 708
Reviews ... ..	232, 474, 714

# INDEX.

- Alexander of Jugoslavia* (S. Graham), review of, 716  
 Anglo-Soviet Relations, by Harvey Wish, 389  
 Arákush, The, from Russian of S. N. Sergeyev-Tsensky, 282  
 Army, Review of the, by Mickiewicz, 249.  
 Axentowicz, T., by W. J. Rose, 691.  
 Ballad, Bulgarian, 496  
 Beneš, Broadcast to Nation, 322, 327  
 Beneš, Edward, by Paul Milyukov, 297  
 Bethlen, Gabriel, by D. Kosáry, 162  
*Bosnia, Annexation of* (B. Schmitt), review, 239  
 Brătescu-Voinești, I. A., A Sea Change, 520  
*Britain and the Dictators*, Seton-Watson (review), 240  
 Bukharin, Last Plea of, 121  
 BURTSEV, V. L., Elders of Sion a Proved Forgery, 91  
 Buryga, from Russian of Leonov, 502  
 Cankar, Ivan, I Know Now, Mother .., 35, Simple Martin, 38.  
 Čapek, Karel, by P. Selver, 695  
 Catherine II and Radishchev, by E. Shmurlo, 618  
 CHERNAVIN, T., Home of Last Tsar, 659  
 Chronicle, Russian, 227, 465, 708.  
 CHYZ, Y. J., Russians in U.S., 638  
 COLEMAN, A. P., Slav Studies in U.S., 372  
 Copernicus, review of books on, 481.  
 CZACHOWSKI, K., Roztworowski, 677.  
 Czachowski, K., *Newest Polish Literature*, review, 722  
 Czech Literature, Twenty Years of, by René Wellek, 329.  
 Czechoslovakia, Key to Danubian Basin, by H. Růpka, 54.  
*Czechs and Germans* (E. Wiskemann), review, 239  
 Day before the Flood, The, by Mickiewicz, 490.  
 Dyboski, R., Count Leon Pininski, 212.  
 "Elders of Sion" a Proved Forgery, by V. L. Burtsev, 91.  
 Elin-Pelin, The Other World, 522  
 Rótvos and Hungarian Liberalism, by B. Menczer, 527  
 "Far East," A State of Hostilities Exists, 571  
 Feldman, Joseph, *Bismarck and Poland*, review, 236  
 Fet, Verses, from Russian of, 203  
*Finland* (J. H. Jackson), review, 723.  
 Fischer, Otokar, by R. Wellek, 215  
 Garstin, Denis, and Russian Revolution, 587  
 Gorky, Maxim, by Alex. Kaun, 429  
 Graham, Stephen, *Alexander of Jugoslavia*, review, 716.  
 Gundulić, Gjivo, by V. Lozovina, 608.  
 GUSTAINIS, VALENTINE, Lithuania First Twenty Years, 606  
 Hertz, F., *Nationalgeist und Politik*, review, 232.  
 Hronský, J. C., Mother Máčik goes to the Polls, 21.  
 Hungarian Independence, Britain and War of, by N. J. Szenczi, 550.  
 JACHIMECKI, Z., Karol Szymanowski, 174  
 Karahychev, A., Death of Khan Krum, 264.  
 KAUN, ALEXANDER, Maxim Gorky, 429  
 KING, BEATRICE, Soviet Education, 135.  
 Klančar, Anthony J., translation of Cankar, 35  
 KOSÁRY, DOMINIC, Gabriel Bethlen, 162  
 KŘIVÝ, MIROSLAV, J. E. Purkyně, 186.  
 Kuprin, by Gleb Struve, 689.  
 Lawther, M., translation from Bulgarian of Elin Pelin, 522  
 Leonov, Leonid, Buryga, 502.  
 Lilies, The, by Mickiewicz, 1.  
 Lithuania, First Twenty Years of, by V. Gustainis, 606.

- LOZOVINA, VINKO, Gundulić, 668  
 Łuskina, Ewa, The Mystic Rose, 272  
 - LYALL, ARCHIBALD, Making of Modern Slovenia, 404
- MACHÁČEK, FRIDOLÍN, The Sokol Movement, 73  
 Marchant, F P, 695  
 Maude, Aylmer, by L Segal, 693  
 MENCZER, BÉLA, Joseph Eotvos and Hungarian Liberation, 527  
 Metternich and Internal Austrian Policy, I, by R W Seton-Watson, 539  
 Mickiewicz, The Review of the Army, 249, Day before the Flood, 490, The Lilies, 1, Twardowski's Wife, 11, Religious Poems, 15  
 MILYUKOV, PAUL, Edward Beneš, 297  
 Morison, W A., translations from Fet, 263, from the Bulgarian of Karaliychev, 264, from Russian of Sergeyev-Tsensky, 282, from Roumanian of Brătescu-Voinești, 520, from Russian of Romanov, 41  
 Mother Máčik Goes to the Polls, by J. C Hronský, 21.  
 Munich and After, 714  
 Mystic Rose, The, by Ewa Łuskina, 272
- Obituary — Shalyapin, 209, Otokar Fischer, 215, Count Pininski, 212, Kuprin, 689, Stanislaw Szober, 690, Teodor Axentowicz, 691; Aylmer Maude, 693; F. P Marchant, 694, Karel Čapek, 695  
 Onegin, English translations of Eugene, by E J Simmons, 198
- Pininski, Count Leon, by R Dyboski, 212  
 Poland's Defences, by General W Sikorski, 343.  
 Poland's Foreign Relations, by K Smogorzewski, 105  
*Polski Słownik*, review, 246  
 POSTNIKOV, S, Separatist Tendencies among Russian Emigrés, 356  
 Purkyně, J E, by M Krivý, 186
- Radin, Dorothea, translations from  
 • Mickiewicz, 1  
 Religious Poems of Mickiewicz, 15  
 RÍPKA, HUBERT, Czechoslovakia, the Key to the Danubian Basin, 54.  
 Romanov, Panteileymon, Three Sketches, 41
- ROSE, W J., Slavonic Cities. Walsaw, 416, Szober, 690; Axentowicz, 691, reviews of *England and Poland* (Wereszycki), 719; of *Newest Polish Literature* (Czechowski), 722; of books on Copernicus, 481; of *Bismarck and Poland* (Feldman), 236; of *Polski Słownik*, 246  
 ROUČEK, J S, Russians in United States, 638  
 Roztworowski, by K Czachowski, 677.  
 Russia and Africa, by S Yakobson, 623  
 Russian Literature, Current, VII Boris Zaytsev, by Gleb Struve, 445  
 Russians in US, by Y J. Chyz and J S. Rouček, 638
- Slavonic Studies, Origins of School of, by R W Seton-Watson, 360; new home of, 724  
 Sea Change, A, from Roumanian of Brătescu-Voinești, 520  
 Schmitt, Bernadotte, *Annexation of Bosnia*, review, 239  
 SEGAL, LOUIS, Aylmer Maude, 693  
 SELVER, PAUL, Karel Čapek, 695  
 Separatist Tendencies among Russian Emigrés, by S. Postnikov, 356  
 Sergeyev-Tsensky, S N, The Arákush, 282  
 Seton-Watson, R W, Origins of School of Slavonic Studies, 360, Metternich and Internal Austrian Policy (I), 539; reviews of *Brest Litovsk* (Wheeler-Bennett), 479, of *Thirty Years' War* (Wedgwood), 484, *Lord Odo Russell* (Taffs), 485; *Alexander of Yugoslavia* (Graham), 716, *Nationalgeist und Politik* (Hertz), 232, *Histoire de Dalmatie* (Vojnovich), 241, Finland (J H. Jackson), 723  
 Sewell-Grant, H C, translations from Cankar, 38.  
 Shalyapin, Fedor, 209.  
 SHMURLO, E, Catherine II and Radishchev, 618  
 SIKORSKI, WŁADYSŁAW, Poland's Defences, 343  
 SIMMONS, ERNEST J, English translations of Eugene Onegin, 198.  
 Simple Martin, by Ivan Cankar, 38  
 Sion, *Elders of*, by V Burtsev, review, 474.  
 Slavonic Cities Warsaw, by W. J. Rose, 416.  
 Slovenia, Making of Modern, by A. Lyall, 404.  
 SMOGORZEWSKI, K, Poland's Foreign Relations, 105

- Sokol Movement, The, by F. Macháček, 73  
 Soviet Education, by Beatrice King, 135  
 Soviet History (III), by B. H. Sumner, 151  
 Soviet Legislation, 219, 452, 697  
 State of Hostilities Exists, A, by "Far East," 571.  
 STRUVE, GLEB, Boris Zaytsev, 445, Kuprin, 689  
 SUMNER, B. H., Soviet History (III), 151  
 Syrovoy, General, broadcast of, 326.  
 SZENCZI, N. J., Britain and War of Hungarian Independence, 557  
 Szober, Stanislas, by W. J. Rose, 690.  
 Szymanowski, Karol, by Z. Jachimiecki, 174  
 Taffs, Winifred, *Lord Odo Russell*, review, 484  
 Tait, Dorothy F., translation from Polish, 272  
 Three Sketches, by P. Romanov, 41  
 To My Russian Friends, by Mickiewicz, 494  
 Transylvania in 17th Century, by D. Kosáry, 162  
 Tsar, Home of the Last, by T. Chernavin, 659  
 Twardowski's Wife, by Mickiewicz, 11.  
 United States, Slavonic Studies in, by A. P. Coleman, 372  
 Vojnović, Lujó, *Histoire de Dalmatie*, review, 241  
 WALPOLE, SIR HUGH, Denis Garstin, 587  
 Walshe, M. O'C., translation of Bulgarian Ballad, 496  
 Wedgwood, C. V., *Thirty Years' War*, review, 484.  
 WELLEK, RENÉ, 20 Years of Czech Literature, 329; Otokar Fischer, 215  
 Wharton, L. E., review of Burtsev, Protocols of Elders of Zion, 474  
 Wheeler-Bennett, J. W., *Brest-Litovsk*, review, 479.  
 WISH, HARVEY, Anglo-Soviet Relations (1924), 389  
 Wiskemann, Elizabeth, *Czechs and Germans*, 239  
 YAKOBSON, SERGIUS, Russia and Africa, 623  
 Yeras, Sidonie, translation from Cankar, 38  
 Zaytsev, Boris, by G. Stiuve, 445.

# THE SLAVONIC AND EAST EUROPEAN REVIEW

VOL. XVII. No. 49

July, 1938

---

## THE LILIES

*Translated from the Polish of* ADAM MICKIEWICZ *by*  
DOROTHEA PRALL RADIN

*Note.*—*Lilies* is from the first volume of poems by Mickiewicz, published in 1822. It is based on a Polish popular ballad. That ballad, which is very simple and is wholly free from miraculous elements, relates how a wife killed her husband, buried him in the garden, and planted rue on his grave. The brothers of the husband arrive, find traces of the murder, and slay the culprit. Mickiewicz, though he preserves the metre of the folk ballad, expands the story greatly, gives it an historical setting in the times of Bolesław the Bold (1058–79), adds touches of style taken from Bürger's *Lenore*, and invests his poem with a moral significance.

Monstrous deed ! A lady bright  
Slays her own, her wedded knight ;  
Buries him beside a brook  
In a grove where none will look.  
Lilies on his grave she plants ;  
As she sows them, thus she chants :  
“ Lily flowers, grow as high  
As my husband deep doth lie ;  
As my husband deep doth lie,  
Do ye, lilies, grow so high ! ”

Dabbled with his blood the wife,  
She who took her husband's life,  
Rushes over hill and dale,  
Speeds away through wood and vale.  
Evening, and the cold winds blow,  
All is dark and chill and foul ;  
Now the cawing of a crow,  
Now the hooting of an owl.

She has come to river lands  
Where a beech's branches rock  
And a hermit's cottage stands :  
Knock, knock ! Knock, knock !

“ What is that ? ” The metal pin  
Falls, the hermit brings a light ;  
With a shriek she rushes in  
Like a vampire of the night.  
Blue her lips and wild her eyes,  
White her face as linen thread ;  
Shivering, the lady cries,  
“ Oh, my husband ! He lies dead ! ”

—“ God be with thee, woman ! What  
Dost thou in the wood alone ?  
What has brought thee to this spot  
While the stormy night-winds moan ? ”

—“ Over wood and marshy hollow  
Shines my castle, but to far  
Kiev must my husband follow  
King Bolésław in the war.  
Years went on, and still among  
Battle's noise he wandered free,  
I was young amid the young,  
Virtue's path is slippery,  
And I broke my vows at last.  
Woe upon me and alack !  
Stern the laws the king has passed,  
And the warriors have come back.

“ But my husband shall not know :  
See the blood upon this blade !  
He is silenced and laid low !—  
Full confession I have made :  
Give me, therefore, holy sage,  
Prayers to say and pilgrimage ;  
Tell me where I am to go !  
I would walk to hell, endure  
Brand, and scourge that tears the skin,  
If I only could be sure  
Night would cover up my sin.”



—“ Woman, dost thou then repent  
Of the crime that brought thee here,  
Or but dread the punishment?  
Go in peace, cast off thy fear,  
Clear thy brow, thy secret lies  
Safe for ever from men’s eyes.  
Thus the Lord commands us : those  
Things thou dost in secret, none  
But thy husband can disclose,  
And thy husband’s life is done.”

With this judgment well content,  
As she came, the lady went.  
Homeward through the night she stole,  
Saying naught to any soul.  
At the door her children wait.  
“ Mother,” eagerly they cry,  
“ Why does father stay so late? ”  
—“ What ! ” she thinks, “ You wait the dead? ”  
But at last she makes reply,  
“ He is in the wood near by,  
He will come tonight,” she said.

So the children wait perplexed  
All the next day and the next ;  
All the week they watch the door,  
Till at last they watch no more.

But the lady finds it hard  
To forget her guilty act ;  
From her lips the smiles are barred,  
And her heart is ever racked.  
Sleep will close her eyes no more ;  
For at night when all is dark  
Something knocks upon the door,  
Something walks the courtyard. Hark !  
“ Children, hear me ! ” comes the cry,  
“ ’Tis your father, it is I ! ”

Through the night she lies awake,  
Conscious of her guilty act,  
On her lips no smiles will break,  
And her heart is ever racked. .

“Hurry, Hanka, for I hear  
Trampling on the bridge. I see  
Clouds of dust now drawing near.  
Are they guests to visit me?  
Haste through wood and highroad, say  
Whether some one rides this way?”

—“They ride hither in their might,  
All the road a whirling cloud,  
And their sharp swords glisten bright  
And their black steeds neigh aloud.  
They are knights-in-arms who ride,  
Brothers of our lord who died.”

—“Greetings! And how dost thou fare?  
Greet us, sister! Tell us, where  
Is our brother?”—“He is dead,  
He no longer lives,” she said.  
—“When?”—“A year ago. He died  
In the war,” the wife replied.  
—“Nay, 'tis false! Be happy thou,  
For the war is over now;  
He is well and of good cheer,  
Soon thou shalt behold him here.”

In her fright the lady paled,  
Swooning, and her senses failed,  
While with vacant eyes she gazed  
Terror-stricken and amazed.  
“Where is he, a man long dead?”  
And then, coming back to life  
Slowly, like a faithful wife  
Who had swooned for joy, she said:  
“Where is he, my own true knight?  
Will he soon rejoice my sight?”

—“He returned with us, but then  
Hastened on ahead that he  
Might receive us with his men  
And the sooner comfort thee.  
He will come, if not today,  
Then tomorrow; he perhaps

In his haste has lost the way.  
We will let a day elapse  
And then seek him. Never fear,  
One more night will bring him here."

They sent searchers high and low,  
Waiting one day, then another ;  
When they cannot find their brother,  
Weeping, they decide to go.

But the lady's pleas begin :  
" Brothers, my beloved kin,  
Autumn is no time for travel,  
Winds are cold and rains are wet ;  
You have waited without cavil,  
Wait a little longer yet."

So they waited. Winter came,  
But no brother. Just the same  
Still they waited, saying then  
Spring would bring him back again.  
But he lies within his grave,  
O'er him flowery branches wave,  
And the lilies grow as high  
As his body deep doth lie.  
So they waited on through spring,  
Putting off their journeying.

For their hostess pleased them well  
And her youth had cast its spell.  
They pretended they would go  
But they tarried even so,  
Waiting on ; and by another  
Summer had forgot their brother.

For the lady pleased them well,  
She was young and cast her spell ;  
And as they were two, they both  
Fell in love and sought her troth.  
Both their hearts by hope were fanned,  
Both were seized with love's alarms ;  
Neither would renounce her charms,

Both could not possess her hand.  
To the lady they agree  
To repair and make their plea.

“ Take our message in good part,  
Lady, once our brother’s wife !  
He has surely lost his life ;  
We sit idle here. Thou art  
Youthful—far too young, in truth,  
To renounce the world and smother  
All the impulses of youth ;  
Take one brother for another ! ”

So they spoke and paused. In each  
Jealousy and anger blazed ;  
Both in turn burst forth in speech,  
Both upon the lady gazed,  
Bit their lips till they were blue,  
Seized their swords and almost drew.

When the lady saw their wrath  
She was doubtful what to say,  
So she sought the forest path,  
Bidding them to wait a day.  
Down she rushed through river lands  
Where the beech’s branches rock  
And the hermit’s cottage stands :  
Knock, knock ! Knock, knock !  
All her story she goes through,  
Asking what she is to do.

“ Tell me how to reconcile them,  
Both would have me, I must choose.  
Either suits me : how beguile them ?  
Who shall win and who shall lose ?  
I have children. I command  
Wealth of stores and settled land,  
But my wealth will soon have fled,  
If I stay alone, unwed.  
Ah, but there can never be  
Any wedded joy for me !  
God has sent a cruel blight

And a spectre haunts my night.  
Scarcely have I closed my eyes,  
Creak ! and up the door-latch flies ;  
And I wake and see and hear  
How it pants as it draws near,  
And its panting and its tread  
Tell me that I hear the dead !  
Whir ! It holds a knife in air,  
Wet with blood, above me there.  
From its mouth the sparks fly free  
And it pulls and pinches me.  
Ah, enough of torment ! I  
Must from my own dwelling fly ;  
Happiness I shall not see,  
Wedded joy is not for me."

—" Daughter," said the priest, " no crime  
But is punished in due time.  
Yet the Lord doth still give ear  
When repentance is sincere.  
I know secrets hid from men,  
And I bring thee words of cheer :  
I can raise thy knight again  
Though he has been dead a year."

—" What, my father ! Do not thou  
Raise the dead ! 'Tis over now,  
And the blade of steel must sever  
Me and him it slew forever.  
I am worthy punishment,  
I will suffer what is sent,  
Only let this ghost relent !  
I will give up all my goods,  
Far within the lonely woods  
In a cloister take the vow,  
Only, father, do not thou  
Raise the dead ! 'Tis over now,  
And the blade of steel must sever  
Me and him it slew forever ! "

Heavily the old man sighed,  
Wrung his hands and hid his face,

Weeping for a little space ;  
 And with sadness he replied :  
 " Go then, while thou canst, and marry :  
 Do not fear the spectre form !  
 In the grave the dead will tarry,  
 For death's gate is hard to storm,  
 And thy husband will appear  
 Only if thou call him here."

—" How appease the brothers? Who  
 Shall be favoured of the two? "  
 —" Let God choose, and do thou call  
 Him on whom the lot shall fall.  
 Let them both at break of day  
 Go and gather flowers, and they  
 From the flowers for thee shall twine  
 Each a wreath and put a sign  
 In the garland that shall show  
 Which is which for all to know ;  
 Then in church with their own hands  
 Place them where the altar stands.  
 He whose wreath thou choosest, be  
 Thine own lord and love shall be."

Then the lady, well content,  
 All her thoughts on marriage bent,  
 Ceased to fear the phantom ; for  
 She knew very well indeed  
 Never in the direst need  
 Would she summon him once more.  
 So, with spirit confident,  
 As she entered, so she went.  
 Homeward hurriedly she stole,  
 Saying naught to any soul.  
 Swift she ran through field and wood,  
 Rushing on ; then, halting, stood,  
 Stood intent and listened. Hark !  
 Some one softly seemed to follow,  
 Something whispered through the hollow  
 Wood, where all was still and dark,  
 "'Tis thy husband, I am here ! "

So she halted, caught by stark  
Terror, listened, and then fled,  
Every hair on end with dread.  
Yet she dared not look around  
Though she heard the whisper sound,  
Echoing ever in her ear,  
“ ’Tis thy husband, I am here.”

But the festive Sunday came  
When her suitor she might claim.  
With the early rays of dawn  
Forth the two young men had gone  
And the lady fair, attended  
By her bridal maids, descended  
To the church; nor did she falter,  
But, advancing to the altar,  
Raised a wreath and bore it round.  
“ Lo, the wreath of lilies! Whose  
Are they, who is it I choose,  
Who the true love I have found? ”

Up the elder brother springs,  
Joy upon his face ashine;  
Claps his hands and leaps and sings,  
“ Mine thou art, those flowers are mine!  
There inside the lily wreath  
I enwove a ribbon band:  
See the token underneath!  
It is mine—I win thy hand.”

—“ ’Tis a lie! ” his brother shouted;  
“ Not far off there is a plot  
In which lily plants have sprouted,  
And these flowers are from that spot,  
In a forest opening,  
On a grave beside a river.  
I will show you grave and spring:  
This my wreath and I the giver! ”

Wrangling thus with evil hearts  
One denies and one upbraids;  
From the scabbards fly their blades

And a bitter combat starts,  
And the wreath before the shrine  
They both pluck at, shouting, " Mine ! "

Suddenly the church door trembled  
And the altar lights were quenched ;  
There before the host assembled  
Rose a form in white ; they blenched,  
For the bearing was well known  
And the arms ; a voice malign  
Then rang out with hollow moan :  
" 'Tis my wreath, and thou art mine !  
From my grave the flowers were broken :  
Bind me, father, with thy stole !  
Evil wife, by every token  
I am thine !   Curst be thy soul !  
Curst be you, my evil brothers,  
Who have thus despoiled my grave !  
Cease your struggle for each other's  
Life-blood.   Mine the wreath you gave !  
Wife and brothers, you shall go  
With me to the world below ! "

Thereupon the church foundation  
Shook.   The walls and arches slipped  
From their lofty elevation,  
Sinking down beneath the crypt.  
All lie buried underground,  
Lilies blossom on the mound,  
And the flowers grow as high  
As the dead man deep did lie.



## TWARDOWSKI'S WIFE

*Translated from the Polish of* ADAM MICKIEWICZ *by*  
DOROTHEA PRALL RADIN

*Note.*—This ballad is from the first volume of poems by Mickiewicz, published in 1822. In Poland there were traditions of an enchanter Twardowski, a Polish Faust who differs from his German fellow-magician in that his adventures are always treated from a humorous point of view. In *Twardowski's Wife* Mickiewicz took from tradition the story of the final meeting of the sorcerer with the devil in an inn called *Rome*, but the incident of the wife is of his own invention, though it is true to the spirit of the legends. By his use of Latin words Mickiewicz gives a touch of the macaronic style usual in 17th century Poland, and thus highly appropriate to his subject. The whole tone of the ballad, however, smacks of 18th century grotesque poetry.

Eating, drinking, smoking, laughter,  
Revelry and wild to-do  
Shake the inn from floor to rafter  
With huzzahing and halloo.

There Twardowski heads the table,  
Arms akimbo, pasha-wise,  
And he shouts, "Show what you're able!"  
Jokes and tricks and terrifies.

Round a soldier playing bully,  
Scolding, shoving lustily,  
Hums his sword-blade—and a woolly  
Rabbit in his place they see!

At a lawyer sitting drinking  
Quietly his bowl of grog  
He has set his wallet clinking—  
And the lawyer is a dog!

To a tailor's forehead clapping  
Three long tubes, he smacks his nose  
Thrice, and at his sudden tapping,  
Out the Danzig vodka flows.

He had drained his cup already  
 When the tankard gave a hum  
 And a clank. "The devil!" said he,  
 "Well, my friend, why have you come?"

In the cup a little devil  
 Of a bob-tailed German brand,  
 Greeted all the guests, most civil,  
 Bowing, prancing, hat in hand.

Then from out the tankard jumping  
 To the floor, two ells he grows:  
 Claws like hawk's, a hooked nose, clumping  
 On one hen's foot, so he goes.

"Ah, Twardowski, brother, greeting!"  
 Says he boldly, at his ease;  
 "Did you not expect this meeting?  
 I am Mephistopheles.

"On Bald Mountain not so lately  
 You bequeathed to me your soul,  
 Wrote your name down accurately  
 On a bull's hide for a scroll.

"All my fiends were at your orders;  
 You, when two years' time had flown,  
 Were to come to Rome. My warders  
 Then should take you for their own.

"Seven years you've spent tormenting  
 Hell with magic, nor do you  
 Plan your journey yet, frequenting  
 Inns, although your bond is due.

"Vengeance, though you count upon her  
 Being late, at last strikes home,  
 And I now arrest Your Honour—  
 For this inn is named *The Rome*."

At this *dictum* so *acerbum*  
 Twardowski fled, but as he ran  
 The devil caught him. "Where's your *verbum*  
*Nobile*," he said, "my man?"

What was to be done? A moment  
Till he forfeited his head !  
Swiftly then Twardowski reckoned  
On a scheme to serve his stead.

“ Read, Mephisto, the condition  
Of the contract on your scroll ;  
When the time of my perdition  
Comes and you demand my soul,

“ I am still to have one little  
Right : to set a threefold task :  
You must do each jot and tittle  
Of whatever I may ask.

“ See the tavern sign, a stallion  
Painted on a canvas ground ;  
Let me jump on the rapscallion,  
Break away, and gallop round.

“ Twist a whip of sand, moreover,  
For me, and upon the brink  
Of the wood build me a cover  
Where I may find food and drink.

“ Make the walls of nutshells matching  
The Carpathians in height ;  
Out of Jews' beards make the thatching  
And pack poppy seed on tight.

“ Look, here is a nail for measure,  
One inch through, three inches long ;  
With three spikes, such is my pleasure,  
Nail each seed down, stout and strong.”

Jumping high for joy, Mephisto  
Waters, feeds, and grooms the horse ;  
Turns a whip of sand, and presto !  
It stands ready for the course.

Then Twardowski mounts the racer,  
Makes it trot and caracole ;  
And the building was no facer—  
There it stood, complete and whole !

“ Well, you’ve won that bout, Sir Devil !  
 Here’s the second ; do your best !  
 Jump in holy water, level  
 With your neck ; the bowl’s been blest.”

Coughing, spitting, ever faster  
 Sweats the devil at this check ;  
 But the servant minds the master,  
 Ducks himself up to his neck.

Out he flew as if projected  
 From a sling, and, snorting wrath,  
 Screamed, “ Now you’re our own elected !  
 Brr ! But what a vapour bath ! ”

—“ One more task before you get me—  
 Even magic has an end—  
 Here’s Madame Twardowska : let me  
 Introduce my little friend.

“ For a year I’ll make my dwelling  
 With Beelzebub. Above  
 You shall pass the year in spelling  
 Me as husband with my love.

“ Swear her love and recognition  
 And obedience unalloyed ;  
 Fail in only one condition,  
 And our contract’s null and void.”

One ear to Twardowski bending,  
 One eye on his wife, but more  
 Feigning than in fact attending,  
 Satan seeks to reach the door.

While Twardowski taunts and teases  
 And attempts to bar his way,  
 Through the keyhole out he squeezes—  
 And is running yet, they say.

## RELIGIOUS POEMS BY ADAM MICKIEWICZ

*Translated from the Polish by DOROTHEA PRALL RADIN*

*Note.*—Of the following poems *Reason and Faith*, first printed in 1833, was probably written in Italy near the close of 1830. It reflects the conflict in the poet's mind between Reason, which bids Mickiewicz fear the consequences of the war that has begun in his country, and his new-found Faith, which bids him trust in the Divine Providence.

The other poems are from the last twenty years of the life of Mickiewicz, a period when he had become absorbed in mysticism and wrote little verse. *Spin Love* is of 1839, the *Fragment of an Improvisation* is of 1840; *Protect Me from Thyself* and *A Vision*, which were not published until after the poet's death, are of uncertain date. Professor Wincenty Lutosławski, a student of Polish mystical poetry, terms the *Vision* not only the greatest work of Mickiewicz, but "the supreme account of mystic experience in all literature," superior even to Canto 33 of Dante's *Paradiso*, which deals with the same subject.

### REASON AND FAITH

When like a cloud before the sun I bent  
My reason-darkened head before the Lord,  
He raised it up to heaven's firmament  
And rainbow lights in thousands on it poured.

And it shall shine a witness to my faith  
Though heaven rain misfortune down; and when  
My people fear the deluge, looking then  
Upon that arc, they shall be true till death.

O Lord, a humble spirit raised me high;  
Although I shine aloft in heaven's blue,  
'Tis thou didst light the lustre and not I:  
A pale reflection from thy flame I drew.

O'er all mankind's low stretches I have gone  
And seen their varied views, their boisterous days,  
Immense and turbid under reason's gaze,  
Little and lucid when faith looked thereon.

And you, proud questioners, you I descried  
Scattered like sweepings that the winds assail,  
Locked in yourselves, as in its shell the snail,  
Small and incurious of the world outside.

Necessity works blindly, so you said,  
It rules us as the moon must rule the sea ;  
And others said, Chance frolics wantonly  
With men, as do the winds high overhead.

But God took up the ocean in His hand  
And bade it ever beat against the rock,  
And then He carved a boundary in the land  
Against which it must ever vainly knock.

Within its grave of earth it still must lie,  
By constant motion gaining not at all ;  
The higher it spouts, the lower it must fall ;  
For ever rising—heaven is still more high.

And yet a beam cast by the sun's own flame  
Upon the roaring ocean does not drown,  
But flashing, breaking in a rainbow crown  
Of light, returns to heaven from whence it came.

O human reason ! Thou, so small before  
The Lord, a drop in His almighty palm,  
The word still calls thee boundless and would soar  
Upon thy waters up to heaven's calm.

The far horizon's edge thou dost appear  
To touch, yet all in vain the swift ship flies ;  
It circles all the earth but is not near  
To heaven ; thy wave will never reach the skies.

Though thou dost swell and fall, grow black or shine  
Hurl up huge waves and in deep gulfs decline,  
Make dark the air with storm-clouds that give birth  
To hail, thou art for ever on the earth.

But that pure light of faith which Heaven raises  
Doth fire thy thunders, melt thy drops. Serene  
And bright it shines, and so thy mirror blazes.  
O thou ! Except for faith, thou wert not seen.

## PROTECT ME FROM THYSELF

Protect me from this search to gain thy sovereignty !  
 For there are moments when thy books are clear to me.  
 Men see the sun-streaked mists as diamonds and gold  
 Where the bright sun itself but darkness can behold.  
 Man, greater than the sun, knows well that covering  
 Of gold is black, made bright by his imagining.  
 Eye meeting eye, I fix my pupils upon thine,  
 And thy two hands I seize and hold them fast in mine,  
 And cry aloud, " Yield up thy secret by a sign ! "  
 Prove thou art mightier than I, or else confess  
 Thy strength and wisdom are but what I too possess.  
 Thou knowest not thine own beginning : has our race  
 Surmised how long ago it rose upon earth's face ?  
 The study of thyself is pleasant unto thee,  
 But does the tribe of man not search its history ?  
 Thy wisdom cannot sound its own deep hidden parts :  
 Do mankind comprehend the secrets of their hearts ?  
 Thou art alone immortal : shall not we be so ?  
 Thou know'st thyself and dost not, and so much we know.  
 Thine end thou dost not know : can we our ends divine ?  
 Thou dost divide and join : we too divide and join.  
 As thou art various, so we vary in our thought.  
 As thou art one, so through our hearts is union wrought.  
 Thou rulest in the skies : we also track the star ;  
 Seas serve thee : there we ride and know how deep they are.  
 O thou who, giving light, dost know not east and west,  
 How has thy difference from man been manifest ?  
 With Satan thou dost war in heaven and on earth :  
 We war with our desires to which the world gives birth.  
 Thou once of old didst take the form of man. Then say,  
 Was that a moment's dress, or was it thine away ?

## A VISION

A ringing roused me, and my body there,  
 Like down that wraps some flower of the field,  
 Burst open, by an angel's breath unsealed,  
 And laid the kernel of my spirit bare.  
 And, so it seemed, I wakened suddenly  
 From the dread dream that had so wearied me.  
 And as one newly wakened wipes the sweat

From off his forehead, so I wiped away  
My unshed past—as in a fresh array  
Of greening herbs the old husks linger yet.  
I saw the earth and all the world around—  
And where there had been darknesses before,  
Secrets and riddles I could not explore,  
And where of old despair was all I found—  
Now every depth and distance was as near  
As when the sun makes darkened waters clear.  
A whole wide sea was open to my glance  
And in its centre God, the Fountainhead.  
Upon the waves a light of bliss was spread  
And I could fly above the vast expanse,  
And move, a beam upon the heavenly beam  
Of God's own wisdom. In my wondrous dream  
I was both world and eye with which to gaze  
Upon a scene where nature lay unrolled  
Like some vast picture underneath the blaze  
Of my one beam. I shone on every part  
And in me, in the fire's central heart,  
I felt all nature suddenly unfold.  
I was the axis in a boundless wheel;  
Myself unmoved, I felt its motion. I  
Was one of the primordial elements  
There where all spirits separate and whence  
They move the world, themselves unmoved on high;  
As beams which, pouring from the sun, conceal  
That sun in their own floods of heat and light,  
Until the central sun is hid from sight.  
And I at the same time was on the rim  
Of that great, boundless wheel, which ever grew  
Toward God, and yet could not encompass Him.  
And as my soul filled full the orb, I knew  
That so eternally its heat would glow,  
Its fire be ever brighter and more great,  
Eternally spread out and overflow,  
Augment, pour forth, shed brilliance, and create,  
Ever more strongly love its own creation  
And ever higher lift its own salvation.

I passed through human bodies as a light  
That travels swiftly through the water might,



Bringing no drop away ; which, though it bore  
Through all, yet comes back stainless as before ;  
Which teaches water where the light begins  
And tells the sun the water's origins.

The portals of men's hearts stood wide ; I looked  
Inside their skulls, as on a brew just cooked  
An alchemist might gaze. I knew what fire  
Of thoughts and passions burned men with desire  
And what decoctions, poisonous or good,  
They secretly distilled. Around me stood,  
Cooling or fanning with their wings the coals,  
Dark spirit forms and angels all in white,  
The foes and guardians of human souls,  
Who laughed or wept—yet kept their watchful sight  
For ever on the charge they held in ward  
As nurses tend the child some mighty lord,  
Its father, has committed to their trust ;  
Though one gives evil counsel and one just.

### SPIN LOVE

Spin love from out your heart as silkworms spin their thread,  
Pour forth your love as fountains pour waters from within.  
Sow it as corn is sown. Let its wide surface spread  
Like gold plate from a golden kernel beaten thin.  
Nurture its growth as mothers feed their children bread.

As waters from the fountainhead  
Plunge underground, let it dive deep ; and then begin  
To blow it high to spaces only winds may win.  
Sow it like corn, and like a mother feed it bread.  
So shall your strength attain to nature's elevation—  
It shall increase and gain the strength of propagation—  
The strength of men, the strength of angels, till it reach  
At last the strength of the Creator of creation.

### FRAGMENT OF AN IMPROVISATION

I do not sort out syllables and rhymes ;  
As I speak now, so I write at all times ;  
I strike my breast, and words gush forth in streams.  
If with one heavenly spark the torrent gleams,

It is not fruit of mind or fantasy,  
 But inspiration flown from God to me.  
 Through it I rule my feeling, comprehend,  
 And see, and judge my sins and future end.

For by the poet but one path is trod :  
 To search for inspiration and seek God.

### TO BOHDAN ZALESKI

[These verses are from a letter written by Mickiewicz to Zaleski on August 15, 1841, under the first rapturous impressions of his meeting with the mystic, Andrzej Towiański: "As soon as you read this letter, fall on your knees and thank God. Great things are happening here . . . Flowers are in my house and spring in my heart and spirit."]

My nightingale ! Fly forth and sing !  
 A song of parting sing  
 To tears once shed and sad dreams sped  
 In thy last carolling.

My nightingale ! Thy wings will fail,  
 The eagle's thou must wear ;  
 Thy talons strong the golden song  
 Of David here shall bear !

The lot is cast, the slow years past,  
 And there sounds forth a voice :  
 The yield is full, the miracle  
 Has come—let all rejoice !

# MOTHER MÁČIK GOES TO THE POLLS

*Translated from the Slovak of J. C. HRONSKÝ by W. A. MORISON*

## I

YES, she went to the polls. How she voted I shall not reveal, for the parson might be vexed, or Mišo Trnka, or somebody else; but go to the polls she did.

Don't you know old Mother Máčik?

Well, well, she's quite a notability! She's been living over by the new school for years now (ever since her sons and their wives found they couldn't put up with her any longer), as solitary as your thumb; and she no longer takes much interest in this world, but rather in that other world she is fast approaching. After vespers the younger women stand by the church for an hour or more, chatting, but Mother Máčik does nothing of the sort. She just glances at the tattlers, then hurries off home, sits down at her oak table, and goes on with her praise of the Lord.

At one time, though, she hadn't to go home for that.

When parson had left the church she would settle herself comfortably on her bench, heave a sigh, and begin to recite prayers in a high, quavering voice, until the vergers came up to her:

"Come, mother, don't you think you've done enough? There's not a soul left in church."

Mother Máčik would regularly peer about her to make sure that everybody had really abandoned God's house; then, seeing no one save the impatient vergers, she would whisper a final prayer for "the sinners" and also make her way home.

But there came a time when all that changed.

A new parson came, and new ways were instituted in the church. A new schoolmaster came, and brought with him new hymns, new hymnbooks and new prayers. Goodness! Mother Máčik's head whirled from all these innovations. Everything new, everything, even God's word! The prayers which she had learnt as a child, and in which she was word-perfect, began to become old-fashioned, and (what was worse) she with them. What good would it do her if she bought a new prayer book? None at all. Even the prayers she knew she had not learnt from books, though she certainly possessed a fine one of her own, with a clasp and studs of yellow metal; but that was simply because it was usual to have one.

"Prayers must come from the heart, not from books," she was wont to say; and there were rogues who would laugh at her behind her back.

Why, I don't know.

She said nothing else to express the mortification she felt at seeing how Agnes Ďuriš had ousted her as the best singer in church, though it gnawed at her vitals to see that woman, full of self-confidence, taking over the rôle which Mother Máčik had felt was hers by right; to see how she opened her book, how she mouthed the words, how proudly she raised her head. Gracious God! How could such a thing be permitted? There was no piety in it, no sincerity—just rattling it off like the multiplication table. Even her voice wasn't up to the mark, and her eyes wandering all over the place in search of admiring glances, and all of it out of a book, every bit of it! Was that worth anything? Perhaps it would even be better not to go to the holy place, rather than allow an honest Christian soul to be mortified like that. No doubt about it, the world was getting worse and worse every day.

And so Mother Máčik, in order not to forget her old ways, would hurry off home to accomplish there what she could not do in church on account of the new order. Old and worn as she was, the Lord's Prayer would sometimes go on for rather a long time, since she only whispered it to herself, and there was no verger at her elbow to give her a nudge if she happened to doze off before she got to the Amen.

Fortunately the children used to play at "golden pig" under her windows, and didn't allow her to doze for long. She was used to it now, and wasn't very startled to be roused from her nap by a shout from Števa Ondráš: "Here's the golden pig!"

So that Sunday, too, she fancied the noise came from beneath her windows when Filip, the village beadle, starting knocking on her door.

"Aren't you at home?"

Mother Máčik turned her face to the door, blinking as though she had in fact only just woken up.

"Where else should I be, my son?"

"Where indeed, God bless you!"

"Come in, come in! And what may your business be with me?"

Filip said never a word, but solemnly felt beneath his arm (where he had a whole bundle of some sort of papers) and carefully laid on the table, one at a time, four little cards.

Mother Máčik quite lost patience.

"Would you mind telling me what that is?"

"It's for the elections, you know. Everybody in the village has four cards, and from them he has to choose one."

"Choose one, you say?"

"That's it."

"How do you mean, choose one?"

"I'm sure I don't know. The village clerk sends them, and says you're to come to the polls."

"I, my son, I?"

"Surely. You're on the list, so you must."

"I expect they've forgotten my old man's dead."

"Wouldn't make a scrap of difference if they had. Women have to join in nowadays. It's today week in the schoolroom," explained Filip as he departed, and from the courtyard he called:

"Keep well!"

She even forgot to see him out as she ought to have done. She stood there by the table in a daze, and turned the cards over and over. Just with the tip of her finger, as though they were red-hot; fearfully, and with great dismay in her heart.—It was print, printed stuff from the mayor's office. But what did it all mean? Choose one, that was it, choose one! But how could you, when you "couldn't quite make out such small print?" And all four as alike as peas, not one bigger or smaller than another, all of the same colour; bless my soul, how was one to choose? And that Filip had gone off like the wind, without giving a bit of help. If it had been a hymn, now—each one had its right time, its right place, and (what was more important) she knew them all by heart—had it been a hymn she could have managed, but printed stuff like this, that was quite another kettle of fish. That Filip fancied everyone was as at home as he in official documents—wouldn't think of helping you, though he easily might.

As Mother Máčik continued to ponder the matter, it occurred to her that next Sunday was a long way off, a whole week away, and that she would have plenty of time to ask people all about it. She unwrapped her prayer book from her kerchief that protected it from the dust and placed the cards in it, very carefully, so as not to crumple them.

Then she sat down again at the table, to continue—not her nap, I should be the last to suggest that!—to continue her contemplations, and to sing quietly to herself at least one more hymn. That usually relieved her mind, and at such moments she didn't even feel so bitter against her daughters-in-law as on other days of the week, for having condemned her to this exile, this solitude. She could even forgive Agnes Ďuriš, and lay the blame for what had happened on her old age. Gradually she would forget even Agnes, and her own

old bones; would forget everything, and the little room would be filled with a quiet, religious peace. Mother Máčik would feel really glad that she was all by herself, that she could quietly count all her sins, and see how many people were in a worse position than she,—on how many poor souls the cross of life had pressed much more heavily, more cruelly.—What wonders a few hymns could work! The voting-cards flew right away, vanished, just as though Filip had never brought them. Mother Máčik had forgotten all about them.

## II

Had there not been such a disturbance throughout the village, she would probably never have given them another thought. She rarely looked in her prayer book, even on Sundays, so that no one could have said it was her fault. But the whole village was in a turmoil! Every day cars would drive up, and gentlemen from the town would carry tables out in front of the inn and hold forth for hours on end, and the school-children had made fine covers for all their primers out of the leaflets that were distributed. What ever could it all mean? Mišo Trnka and Ondrej Králik, it was said, had almost come to blows over those little cards. Just fancy! Everybody had received his four; why, Filip said he had even had to take some to the dratted Gipsies, as though *they* would dream of worrying their heads over such nonsense.

That's how things were.

Mother Máčik was not really conscious of the fact that, besides puzzlement, a sort of fear oppressed her heart at the thought of those cards. But she couldn't help thinking they must be important for everybody to be so excited, to stand all day long in front of the inn, now, at a time when there was so much work to do that two pairs of hands apiece wouldn't have been enough to cope with it.

She would take the kerchief with the prayer book from the window-sill, unfold it, look at the cards, and—see nothing. Nothing at all. Just some sort of letters she couldn't make out, circles, dots. Yet they fascinated her. It couldn't be for nothing. Gentlemen did not run about for nothing—far from it!—hand out papers to people for nothing. . . . But what exactly was going to happen next Sunday she couldn't for the life of her conceive.

She must do something about it.

She put the cards back into the prayer book and tucked the prayer book under her arm. You'd have thought she was setting out for church. But no. Mother Máčik wasn't going that far, but just

next door, to the new school. The new schoolmaster (nearly as learned a man as the parson), was, they said, always ready to help, though some folk were rather cross with him for keeping the children in school such long hours; so she was going to ask his advice. Even though he had no children of hers under him, she might as well try. It's true that it was easier to call on the old schoolmaster; he'd even give you a word of praise, and ask you how things were, and reproach you for not looking in before; whereas the new man, they said, got quite cross if his girls had their hair plastered smooth, even though the pomade smelt something lovely. But on the other hand he was always ready to write a letter—Goodness, how many letters he must have written when the boys were away at the war!—so perhaps he wouldn't mind giving her a little advice.

This mental preparation was very necessary before Mother Máčik could pluck up sufficient courage to venture into her neighbour's courtyard. She hadn't by any means forgotten the business of the white cock—oh dear no! She had only meant it kindly, and the schoolmaster had been wrong to get so angry. Why, even a little child knew that a white cock did no good about a house, and should have its neck twisted without delay. She had felt she must point out the risk he was running.

The schoolmaster had only laughed.

"Mark my words," she had said, "one day you'll realise that what I am telling you is as true as the Gospel."

The schoolmaster had just laughed, and hadn't killed that white devil. Said it was all nonsense, a stupid superstition. If only he'd known! Things had soon come to an issue, when barely a few weeks had passed. That Sunday the church was full of people, even the folk from the hills were already sitting in their places; the parson had his vestments on, everything was ready to begin—but not a sound from the organ.—"Where's the schoolmaster?"—"Ill, neighbour, ill"—and in vain the womenfolk twisted their necks to see; no one was sitting at the organ; the seat was empty. The very church seemed empty; you couldn't sing or pray so well without the familiar accompaniment.—Aha, the white cock! Didn't I say so?—thought Mother Máčik to herself;—didn't I advise him to kill it? Now it's upsetting the whole village, spoiling all our pleasure. I don't suppose he's laughing now; he would have done well to listen to me.

She hadn't stayed last in church that time, but instead of hurrying off home she had made straight for the school-house. Her face full of sympathy, of care, her lips sucked deeper into her toothless mouth,

and her words just right for the occasion. Even her voice had sounded different, as she shut the door behind her and bowed respectfully.

The schoolmaster put the big book he was reading down on the quilt (Goodness, even in this distress he couldn't give those books a rest!), smiled, seemed glad to see her.

"So you've come to visit me, neighbour?"

"Indeed I have, schoolmaster; how could I not come? But it's sad I am to see you on the bed of sickness."

That's what she had said to him.

"But I'm not so ill as all that! I shall soon get well again, and forget all about it; we all have to go through it at times."

"True, true, schoolmaster; if only it's a small sickness, if only the good God in his mercy doesn't try you more sorely. . . ."

"We must hope for the best." And again he had smiled.

"But it would have been safer, I fancy, if . . ."

"Yes?"

"If you had listened to me when I spoke to you in the spring . . ."

The schoolmaster at once realised she was referring to the white cock. He shoved the book further away from him, and frowned as he did at the organ when Ďuro Popálenec sang false.

"Nonsense," said he.

"Well, the old schoolmaster—God rest his soul!—had just the same trouble, and he said I was quite right."

"Why, he must have been . . ."

He didn't finish what he was going to say, but it had clearly been something terrible. Fancy speaking ill of a dead man! . . .

She knew at once that she shouldn't have mentioned that good-for-nothing beast, that pest, but . . . how could she help feeling sorry for the poor man?

He read her such a lecture that her breath failed her and her eyes filled with tears. She didn't know how she managed to get outside, or even if she stopped to say good-bye.

So now she had to pluck up all her courage to venture in again, for she had not forgotten that cock; although last autumn, when he was selecting his seedlings, the schoolmaster had spoken to her just as though nothing had happened.

And since people spoke well of him . . . well, she would see!

In the school-yard was an apple-tree, just about to burst into flower, and under the tree was a bench. The sun was shining down with all its might, but our schoolmaster was keeping out of its rays;



he sat under the apple-tree, and was surely thinking to himself how beautiful everything would look in May. He spied his neighbour at once, scarcely had she turned in at the top of the yard, and he smiled. So he was in a smiling mood.

"I've eaten that cock, neighbour," he said, turning towards her. Mother Máčik felt rather confused. He hasn't forgotten it (she thought); he's laughing at me. As long as he doesn't get as angry as he was that time! . . .

No, he wasn't angry. In fact, he had felt sorry immediately afterwards that he had ridiculed her, scolded her; he should rather have tried to convince her, to straighten out her ideas.

"What can I do for you, neighbour?"

"I've come for advice, schoolmaster, for advice. I'm just an old woman—and what good old people are nowadays, I don't know. If he's not angry, I said to myself, I'll go and see him; and so here I am. The village clerk has sent me some printed things—Filip brought them—and I simply don't know what I am to do with them."

"Well let me have a look at them. Just give them here."

His neighbour did as he bade. She put her kerchief on her knees, untied it, took out the prayer book and from it the cards.

"Ah, for the elections." The schoolmaster recognised the cards at once, scarcely had she got her fingers on them.

"Yes, that's what Filip said. But what does it mean? I'm just an old woman—what am I supposed to do with them?"

"You haven't to do anything with them. Just keep them safe. On Sunday come to the school here, and you'll see. You'll choose the one you want to vote for, put it in an envelope they'll give you, then throw it into a ballot-box, and the whole thing's over. Quite simple, isn't it?"

Mother Máčik nodded "Yes," but you could see by her expression that she hadn't understood a syllable, much less a word, of all he had said to her.

Our schoolmaster is trained to be patient. He began all over again.

"You will come here to the school. From the cards you will choose the one you like best, and slip it into an envelope; the envelope they will give you here. When you have done that, throw the three cards you have left where they tell you to, and put the one in the envelope into the ballot-box; they'll show you where that is, too. Now do you understand?"

"I understand, I understand, but . . . how?"

" Why, I've just told you how ! "

" But schoolmaster, which one am I to choose ? "

" The one you like best."

" But how am I to know which one I like best ? "

" Of course ! You can't read. I forgot."

She wanted to tell him that she " just couldn't make out such small print," but he didn't give her a chance, and went straight on. He took the cards, spread them out, and started to explain.

" You see these black spots ? "

" How should I not see them ? Of course I do."

" Very well, then. On this card there is one spot, on this one two, on this one three, and on this one four. Do you see that ? "

Mother Máčik saw that—how could she not see it?—and the schoolmaster explained, expounded, praised, blamed, persuaded, instructed; the schoolmaster went at it hammer and tongs till he perspired, just like the time Miško the mayor's son wouldn't believe him when he said that a motor-car goes by itself, with no horses in front to pull it. He talked on and on, till Mother Máčik's head was in a whirl with all sorts of envelopes, ballot-boxes, policies, platforms, and her legs almost gave way beneath her. Each word he uttered was a stone, a fresh burden, a great burden which made her knees tremble. Her mind was confused and her hands shook, so that she could scarcely hold the cards when he gave them back to her. They seemed to have grown in importance as he held them and expounded. They were obviously tremendously important ! But you needed so much wisdom to understand why. She hadn't understood a thing of all he had told her, save that the cards were enormously important. But why ? To understand that, one needed to be the schoolmaster himself.

Mother Máčik even forgot to wrap her prayer book up in the kerchief, those evil black spots had so upset her . . .

Goodness ! It would have been better had she never asked his advice, never ventured into his courtyard. What advice had he given her ? None. None at all. Things had been much better in the old days, much better. Only the men went to vote, and that in the town. The mayor came and explained everything beautifully : when they were to set out by cart, what they were to take with them in their knapsacks, and whom they were to vote for.

But now ?

Now they had changed all that as well.

You no longer voted for a candidate, but for a list, a piece of paper. Dear oh dear, the whole world was changing. Every-

thing was different, everything new. What business was that for women—old women, poor widows? There you were, waiting for the passing-bell to toll, and they came and pursued you, worried you, tormented you . . .

Mother Máčik got quite hot, but not from the sun. She was angry with the dratted cards, but at the same time afraid of them. She would have liked to express what she felt, but she couldn't say anything to his face. He might get angry again, and how would that help? She must simply get away, get away as fast as she could.

Our schoolmaster smiled contentedly as she left the courtyard, thinking to himself that he had done his duty most conscientiously. He didn't dream how much he had upset the poor old soul.

He ought to have seen her, but of course he couldn't see through the courtyard wall. Off she shot, straight along the road, almost at a trot. At any other time she would have glanced into every courtyard, looking at every gosling, at the green corn on the hillocks and the little clouds in the east; and after a time her left leg would have begun to ache below the knee. But now she hadn't time for any of that. She must hurry. Her papers tucked under her arm, and there on the other side lived Mišo Trnka the shoemaker—she would go and see him. It was easier to understand him; and last year he had borrowed a book from the parsonage, as thick as your fist, and he'd read it from cover to cover—so he might be able to make sense of the black dots too.

But was he at home?

Shoemakers nearly always are at home, Mother Máčik knew; you'd just stand under his window, and at once you'd be able to tell. She stopped there for a moment, and sure enough she heard the sound of hammering. That was the shoemaker hammering away at a sole, or perhaps at his son and apprentice Petrik. Mother Máčik didn't mind which. The thing was that he was at home. This of itself made her feel better, and she walked boldly in.

"Oh dear, oh dear! So much worry, so much care, I can hardly keep on my legs. Last week I dreamed of the old gravedigger who died, and I knew at once that something was going to happen. I could feel it in my bones. Something's bound to happen when I dream of old Ondrej; that dream never did forbode good. First thing in the morning I went to see if my hen had laid an egg, but not she. There you are, I said to myself; and that isn't the last trouble that will befall you. Nor was it. On Sunday who should come but Filip, with four little tickets . . ."

"Oh yes, for the elections," broke in the shoemaker, thus putting a stop to her flow of words; and he even loosened the strap by which a boot was fastened to his knee sole-upwards, for Mišo Trnka was a great politician. The first part of what she had said had gone in at one ear and out of the other, while his awl had not stopped working; but Filip and the lists, that was another thing! The hammering ceased at once, the boot vanished beneath his stool, and his face took on a flush. His moustache bristled under his wide nose, the bald patch above his wrinkled forehead began to gleam, and his colourless eyes filled with wisdom.

"For the elections," he repeated, nodding portentously.

"Yes, that's what people say; the schoolmaster told me so, too. I've been so worried; you know how it is with old folk, they can't grasp things so quickly as the young ones."

"But it's nothing to worry about."

"No?"

"No need to worry at all." And the shoemaker's sparse eyebrows, coming to life, corroborated the assertion.

"Well, well! And I've nearly been worried to death. An old person like me can't get to sleep at night, keeps thinking of things; and I do want to do the right thing. It's easy for a learned man like yourself."

Mišo accepted this praise with a satisfied smile, straightened his bent back self-confidently and added, just for the sake of saying something:

"You'll manage all right. Just throw the one you like best into the box, and that's all there is to it."

"Dear, oh dear! It's easy for you to talk, shoemaker; if only I knew which one I do like best, when they're all exactly alike!"

"Now, now, that isn't true," objected Mišo. "They wouldn't have given you four all alike, take my word for it."

"No doubt, shoemaker, no doubt; you understand all about such things. Perhaps mine aren't alike after all." And she reached once more for the kerchief under her arm to fetch out the cards.

Mišo followed her every movement with great attention.

"There you are; yours aren't alike either. On one there are more beans, on another less," said he with a very amiable smile, taking the papers in his hand.

"Beans, you say?" repeated Mother Máčik in surprise, wondering whether he could possibly be making fun of her.

"Beans, that's what I said. On each card there are little

black beans, only on one card there are more and on another less."

Mother Máčik at once began to study the cards carefully, turning them this way and that, and finally she nodded.

"It's just as you say," she whispered contentedly, "just as you say."

And she had to smile, for the distinguishing marks on the cards really did look like beans that had turned black with age. Why couldn't the schoolmaster have pointed that out? A bean was a thing she knew all about. She had plenty at home; you could take them and cook them and eat them. But it was left to Mišo Trnka to draw her attention to that. There was no denying it, Mišo was no Tom, Dick or Harry; it was only right that he should have a business of his own.

And Mišo, as though he could read her thoughts, at once endeavoured to demonstrate the truth of his words.

"All the rest is nothing to bother about. If you look at the beans, you know where you stand. Take this card with one bean on it; now what good did one bean ever do anybody? Two beans—that's a little better; three beans—better still, but still not good enough. Whereas here you have four beans, and with four beans you'd get a little flavour in your soup."

Mother Máčik understood. You could see it by her face; the black speck in her yellow eyeballs brightened, her fallen cheeks trembled a little. It was true, quite true; by the beans it was easy to judge people, easy to choose between them. And Mišo was a good man; didn't grudge his words, repeated it all over again so that she couldn't possibly make a mistake. Dear, dear, how easy it was! How much easier she was at heart, how very much easier! Straight away she felt more intelligent, more capable of retaining what the shoemaker had said; for he took his time about it, didn't rattle it off as some folk might have done. Once he started talking, he wasn't in a hurry to stop. The shoemaker was not merely a politician, he was an orator too, and a very eloquent one. He was helped in this by his sparse eyebrows, and the bald patch above his brow, and his legs, and his worn, dirt-incrusted, muscular hands. He constantly moved about as he talked, and could emphasise with his hands the meaning of every single word. He wasn't content with Mother Máčik's understanding about the beans, oh dear no! Beautifully, with feeling, he read the cards all out from beginning to end, all the printed words; and fortunately he immediately added that that was by no means the important part, was not in fact important at all; that the beans were the things.

Otherwise Mother Máčik might have grown sad again, and Mišo didn't desire that. Mišo was a kind man; Mišo would help. He reached confidently for the cards, pulled out the one with the four beans on it, and handed it to her :

"This is the one for you to put in the box."

Mother Máčik could have embraced him for joy. Why not, seeing that he was even relieving her of that worry? A good man he was, a decent man, an honest man.

"You must keep it apart somewhere, and not mix it up with the others," Trnka warned her.

"I will indeed," she nodded, and wondered how she could possibly repay him for all his kindness.

And Mišo the shoemaker didn't forget about Sunday either. He explained it all; he knew everything that would happen, just as though he had read it in a book. He didn't forget the little paper bag for the card, or the ballot-box that the village beadle had had to make specially for this occasion. He had seen it with his own eyes; it was almost exactly like the one fastened to the wall outside the post-office, and it had just the same sort of slit in the middle.

Weight after weight fell from her anguished soul. Each word was balm; her heart was full of an unknown gladness, and her thoughts clear and tranquil. It almost seemed to her it must be Sunday, the holy day when she would silently relieve her soul at home, sitting at the oaken table.

She thanked Mišo in the doorway and from the courtyard, and she was still thanking him as she made her way down through the village. At every step she praised him under her breath :

"A decent fellow, that Mišo, a very decent fellow! And learned too—more learned I'll vow than him over there at the new school. Made it all as clear as daylight. Yes, I'm sure he must be more learned than the schoolmaster; he's so much easier to understand . . ."

And catching sight of the school-building, she glanced swiftly away from it, as though to emphasise the truth of her judgment.

### III.

By the school all was agog.

The sun flickered wantonly over the bright dresses and kerchiefs till your eyes were dazzled. Everyone was full of talk and questions. Mišo Trnka and Ondrej Králik were sure to lose their voices before the day was out, they talked so much. With the parson it was

different; he was used to talking a lot, and it couldn't do him any harm. But Ondrej shouldn't strain his voice so, especially as no one was listening to him.

By the door stood the gendarmes and assured the impatient crowd that the voting would begin at once; the electoral commission had merely to fasten the tilt from the mayor's cart against the wall in the corner (that's where the electors would go in secret to put their card in the envelope), and Filip the beadle must fetch a corn bin for the rejected voting-cards.

At length the ballot-box was on the table, and the gendarmes began to let the voters into the room one at a time. Things went smoothly. It had never been like this before, yet nearly everybody knew what he had to do. It seemed as though that wagon-tilt had always been in that corner and as though everyone were familiar with it. Only Mother Máčik was somewhat uneasy. She didn't let a single one of those who came out go past without a question, while she had collared Mišo Trnka three times "for a last word." At last the parson had a bright idea, and pushed the chosen card between her thumb and forefinger and the other cards between two other fingers. That was certainly a good idea, for those beans seemed to be playing her tricks today and her memory was shirking its duty; she was sure she would forget every word, though somebody with plenty of patience had explained it all to her at least a hundred times. With one card next to her thumb and the rest next to her forefinger, she finally found her fingers were aching. Of course. If it had been something thicker; but bits of paper—one would rather carry logs! At last she had to put them back into the book again, and the book under her arm.

By this time few voters remained by the school-house. There was nobody by the bin, and the mayor had to come out and ask from the doorway whether anybody had not yet been inside.

"I haven't, mayor, I haven't," announced Mother Máčik.

"Then come along; not a soul's been inside for the last hour. What are you waiting for?"

What, indeed, was she waiting for? She wasn't waiting for anything special; she just hadn't realised that things had to be done in such a hurry. And she had left the cards in her book, had forgotten about them in her flurry. But kind people were there, presiding at the election-table; they reminded her of the cards, advised her, helped her, tranquillised her. Mother Máčik unwound the kerchief, opened her prayer book, and took out the card that Mišo Trnka had told her to keep separate.

"This is the one I want to put in," she said, showing it to them; and was surprised that no one took it from her.

"That's not the way to do it," smiled the mayor. "You must show them all to us, so that we can see that you have all four, and then——"

"Of course I have them; why shouldn't I?" she broke in, not waiting for him to finish, and handed them over.—I do believe he thinks I want to keep the dratted things!—she thought to herself, and looked angrily at the mayor. And immediately she had cause for further anger. The mayor handed all four cards to a gentleman who was sitting rather to one side, and without so much as by your leave he started to turn them and shuffle them this way and that.

Mother Máčik felt as though she had been struck in the face.

She had kept her card carefully in her prayer book, separate as Mišo Trnka had advised her, carried it between her thumb and forefinger as the parson had suggested until her fingers ached, and he, the wretch, was mixing it up with the rest, mixing them all up on purpose!

Suddenly she remembered Trnka's beans. Now she felt afraid no longer. When they handed her the envelope and the cards she was quite calm as she made her way behind the tilt; it was the members of the commission who were getting a little impatient. And no wonder; she was the last to vote.

They all heaved a sigh of relief when she had pushed the envelope through the little slit and thrown the other cards in the corn bin. Rid of her at last!

And as for Mother Máčik, scarcely had she got through the doorway than she twisted her toothless mouth; I'll be blessed if she wasn't smiling!

"The demons! They thought they'd catch me. He mixed them up on purpose to confuse me, just on purpose. Thought an old woman like me was quite silly. He-he! they thought they'd catch me, but they didn't!"

That's what she said to herself.

She felt so cheerful as she went up through the village that she would have liked to boast of her exploit. But there was no sign of Mišo, or of anybody else for that matter; just as though everybody had died. Only the children running about in the meadow. Never mind. At home she could give vent to her joy. Perhaps reverse her usual order; first she would sing a few hymns, and then say a prayer. Yes. Almost of their own accord hymns forced their way into her



throat, and every corner of her being was filled with a great peace, a great happiness.

She had been to the polls.

Yes, she had been to the polls. How she voted I shall not reveal, for the parson might be angry, or Mišo the shoemaker, or the school-master, or somebody else.

But if anybody was curious, Mother Mačik would gladly tell the whole story.

"Aha, they thought they'd catch me; but they didn't—not me! I took good care of the card that Mišo told me to—very good care."

And she would step over to the window-sill, unfold the kerchief, and from the prayer book produce—her voting card, to convince any Doubting Thomas by the testimony of his own eyes that she had indeed been to the polls.

## I KNOW NOW, MOTHER . . .

*Translated from the Slovene of IVAN CANKAR by* .  
ANTHONY J. KLANČAR.

FIVE of us sat at the table and waited. At first, we laughed and talked, then we played dominoes. Finally, we tired of this and grew quiet.

My eldest sister was thirteen, my youngest brother, five. But in our hearts we were old, very old: we knew care and fear.

Whenever we heard steps outside, we would turn toward the door and stare at it breathlessly with big eyes and open mouths.

"She's coming!"

The sound of footsteps would fade away, and we would look at each other silently. Our eyes were tearful, and our lips quivered.

We were very hungry. It was growing dark, and Mother did not come. A good hour ago she had set out, God knows where. We only knew that when she returned she would bring back bread. We never doubted this, for it was growing towards evening, and in the evening there must be supper.

Hard and terrible is a child in his trust. In the evening there must be supper. Unmerciful is a child in his faith. In the evening there must be supper, Mother. Go and get it! Dig it out of the earth, snatch it out of the clouds!

When she went out, she seemed small and bent. She had a deep furrow on her brow.

"I'm coming back soon!" she said.

We thought she was only going to the baker three hundred yards away. A minute there, a minute back. Even if she would stop to chat for a while, it couldn't take her more than five minutes, or at most, ten. We watched the clock which hung on the wall by the stove. Its long minute hand moved slowly, and though it was in no great hurry it had roamed around the whole black circle already.

"She didn't go to the bakery!" Hanca said.

"She went to the store!" Franca exclaimed.

"But if they don't give her anything!" I said.

They looked at me as if I had said something not to be understood, something very strange.

"Don't give her anything?" Hanca asked, surprised.

"In the evening there must be supper!" Franca exclaimed.

Outside, the evening dozed on. It was night in the room. Our eyes were young and experienced, accustomed to the dark. We looked at each other—we were older than an hour ago.

But we weren't afraid of Death, the White Woman, or witches, or vampires. Once my younger sister and I went past a shock of sheaves which stood in a field apart from the rest. They said that it was haunted there. In front of the shock of sheaves stood a decaying tree-stump which shone strangely—like a big man in a flaming sheet. We held each other's hands and went by unafraid.

Still, there was fear in our hearts aged by premature experiences. Something enormous rose up to the sky in the distance, came nearer, rising higher and growing more enormous, black and terrible. It almost veiled the whole horizon. We saw Life and were afraid.

Tears came to our eyes, but nobody sobbed aloud. Whenever strange footsteps aroused us and everything was quiet again in the room and outside, a hope rose in us, a hope which is only known to one whom Life has knocked powerless to the floor.

"This will never end! It'll never be different! Mother isn't coming! She won't bring the bread. We'll all die!"

Our despair was great, but it awoke in us something else more sinister, more terrible. A bitter, malicious hatred of Mother suddenly arose not only in me, but in all five of us who sat around the table in the dark room.

"She could if she wanted to! She brought us bread last night! Why shouldn't she to-night, when we are just as hungry as last night! She's standing God knows where, visiting and laughing and caring nothing about us! She said she'd come at once. An hour has passed already since she left, maybe even an hour and a half. . . . She's waiting on purpose, she's idling in the street, she's gossiping with

the neighbours. Most likely she's already eaten her supper, and there's no hurry to bring home the bread ! ”

We realised it all in the silence, we knew exactly what was in our minds : “ You, too, think this, little sister ! You, too, believe this, little brother ! ” And at that moment there was no longer any love among us.

It was night, but we could still see each other's eyes, which spoke silently :

“ I know you, little sister. I know exactly why you're so quiet ! Your thought is a mortal sin which will never pass out of your soul ! ”

“ I know you, little brother. I can see clearly what you so quietly said about me ! Your sin will never pass away, too.”

Outside, in front of our neighbour's house, the dog began to whine. The sound it made was sad, choked.

“ He's hungry and he's whining ! ” Sister explained.

Suddenly my youngest brother began to cry aloud. His crying was very much like that whining.

“ Stop it ! ” Sister grew angry, but there was a sob in her voice, too. We looked at the table and trembled.

“ I'm going to look on the street,” I said.

“ Why look ? She won't come any sooner, if she comes at all ! ”

...

Slowly and quietly the door opened. Mother stood on the threshold.

We could distinguish her face as if we had seen it in broad daylight. Mother's face was very white and tiny. Her eyes were red from weeping. They searched around the room timidly. It is thus that a sinner looks at his hard-hearted judge.

Mother was afraid of us.

“ Did you wait long ? ” she said, with a quiet pleading voice. “ I couldn't get it sooner. . . . They wouldn't give . . . ” and stopped.

She held a loaf of bread close to her body. We could see from afar already that its crust was beautifully yellow. . . .

O Mother, I know now. We ate your body and drank your blood ! That is why you left us so early ! That is why there is no joy in our hearts now, no happiness in what we do ! . . .

## SIMPLE MARTIN

*Translated from the Slovene of IVAN CANKAR by SIDONIE YERAS and  
HY. C. SEWELL-GRANT.*

FROM time to time a tall, strong, youngish fellow came to our place, to offer his services as a farm help. He would work for a few days, then quickly spend all his evenings in drinking, and vanish—God knows where. He came shyly, and smiled awkwardly, like a child who has been playing truant in the woods and fears punishment. His face by no means accorded with his broad-shouldered body and paw-like hands, it was quite a childish face, in which the light blue eyes looked so innocent; eyes which were sinless, and had known neither temptation nor evil. Who was he? Who were his relatives? Where did he come from? These things I have not been able to discover, for he invariably told a different tale, which resulted in even his birthplace not being endowed with a definite locale. Sometimes I fancy that he came of a well-to-do family, he was so neatly dressed—on Sundays and holidays almost like town-folk, with his white waistcoat and coloured necktie. At times he wept bitterly and complained of not having a place in the whole world in which to lay his head. Once, when he had tied up his bundle to leave us, he said that he was going to get married: that all was quite ready and awaiting him—the bride, and her trousseau and everything. A fortnight later he came back; he was somewhat thinner, his eyes were sunken, his clothes dusty, and he smelt of wine. We asked him about his bride. “Oh, women!” was his sole contemptuous answer as he went towards the shed.

The other day he was carrying a heavy log on his shoulder, from the wood, up the hill-side. He did not seem to feel the weight—he even whistled.

“Well, Martin,” I ventured, “how does it happen that you are not a soldier, strong as you are, when even I, weak as I am, have worn the grey coat.”

“But I was a soldier, I was,” he hastened to say, “but . . . they sent me away.” And I fancied that he slightly blushed.

That very evening he showed me what had been written in his soldier's pocket book on his discharge. It stood there that he had been recognised as weak-minded. I asked him how long, and where, he had served the Emperor, how it had fared with him, what he had seen, what he had experienced. What else could I say?

His innocent face was quite disturbed, like that of a timid child,

who suddenly sees before him a man who long ago frightened him, and whom he has never forgotten. He bowed his head.

"They fouled my tin cup when I was asleep. . . ."

"What did they do?"

"Oh! Who can say?"

And whenever I asked him about those times, he always, with fear and disgust, complained about their dirtying his cup in the night. He never told one anything else.

Snow fell as it had never fallen, and on the hills it was waist-deep or more. We were sitting by the stove in our warm den, and our thoughts were chained within us; shy and shivering they hid in the stillness of the heart, and dared not come up to our lips. The curtain had been drawn before the window; outside it was a white night, endless in its peace and its cold emptiness. The maid had gone to lock the front door, when a mighty fist battered at it, and a voice was heard, crying:

"Open, people, for God's sake!"

And in came Martin. He shook the snow off his coat and top-boots. His teeth chattered, he blinked quickly and looked away, for the maid was holding the candle right in his face.

"Well, it is so . . . the way is long, long, my God . . . and steep . . . and the snow is very deep."

He stammered, he spoke to himself, and possibly did not himself know what he was saying. He looked shyly round the room as if he were seeking or, maybe, fearing somebody. He set his bundle on the floor, his staff in a corner, and then joined us by the stove; he placed his hands on his knees, bent his body very low, and bowed his head—he was evidently very weary.

"Where have you roamed, vagabond Martin, at such hours, and in such a storm?"

He rubbed his hands, shook his head, and looked down at the floor.

"Far from here . . . right away in the Horyul Valley. We both of us waded and wandered wearily—and lost our way too, naturally . . . for there are no roads . . . and there are no houses either . . . and if there are any, they are closed and locked to a poor wanderer."

We gave him bread and wine. He ate greedily; he gulped down his wine; and while he ate and drank I saw that his hands were shaking, and his face looked old and sickly.

"Who was with you, then," asked the maid, "since you say that you both waded and wandered?"

"Who? . . . a wanderer—he joined me somewhere 'about the hills of Polhogradec . . ."

"Where did he stop?"

"Nowhere. He went on . . . he went on his way." With half-closed eyes, as if he were ashamed, he looked steadily at the floor; his lips made an effort to smile and quivered:

"He is a man who does not want company . . . True! . . . If we sighted a house with lighted windows, he dragged me away. He has still a long way to go, a very long way . . . but he will do it . . . for he is a wanderer."

"Strange wanderer," laughed the maid. She took the candle, yawned widely, and went to bed.

We remained alone by the stove. There was wine before us on the table. He talked lower, in a stifled whisper, as if the very night, in its loneliness and its anguish, were speaking from out of his restless heart:—

"But I have not been in the Horyul Valley," he began. "What should I seek there? I said it on purpose, so that they should not inquire after him, poor soul . . . I was right away on the other side, somewhere near Kamnik—it is from there that I was coming . . . he joined me near the village of Cernuc. At first I did not know him; I thought it was but my shadow that moved and swayed under that pale sun. He came quite close to me, and patted me on the shoulder; then I looked fixedly at him and saw who he was. My heart ached . . . as never before . . . He looked much older; his beard, once so fair and so beautiful, was quite grey, and his eyes were tearful and dim, with a red rim around them. His coat was quite tattered, and hung in rags about him, he was shivering with cold, and leant on a long shepherd's staff. . . . He tumbled, sank in the snow, and fell on his knees, for he was very tired from his long journey, and maybe hungry too. I pitied him—but what could I do, what could I give him? I took him by the arm to help him a little, but I was very weary myself. . . . Night was falling as we came near the high-road . . . there was a sentry there, with rifle and bayonet; the soldier looked at us inquiringly, and then my companion drew me away by the sleeve, and we went on through the fields, stumbling, wading, falling—God have mercy upon us! He did not complain, he did not utter a single word. Somewhere, quite near, I saw a warm light; I went towards it that I might be allowed to warm myself, but he

shuddered, and drew me away. . . . He feared people, and he wept on and on—even his hand shook with his sobs.”

“Who was he,” I asked.

He leaned quite close to my lips: “It was He, Himself—Jesu . . .”

I shuddered from head to foot, as if in fear of something stupendous, which I felt to be quite near, quite close to the door.

“It was He, Himself—Jesu . . .”

He spoke no more. After a while, he looked straight at me with his childish blue eyes, and confidently smiled at me.

“I told Him all,” he whispered, “. . . and also about that cup I told Him.”

The next morning he was nowhere to be seen, neither in the barn, nor under the shed. He was gone, and I do not think he will ever come back.

## THREE SKETCHES

*Translated from the Russian of PANTELEYMON ROMANOV by*  
W. A. MORISON.

*These three sketches, published in Soviet Russia, are out of the period of disorder in the early years of communist rule.*

### A PATIENT PEOPLE

As part of the war with dirt, a week's campaign for personal cleanliness had been declared. Outside the Soviet baths stood a long queue with bundles and bath-switches under their arms.

The would-be bathers, cowering under the rain and stamping in the mud to warm their feet, stood waiting for the door to open to admit the next batch.

“Now they've taken it into their heads to put everybody through the mangle,” observed someone. “It's a dog's life.”

“Blinking shame, I call it—driving people in by main force. I've heard as how folks with no receipt from the baths won't be issued no grub.”

“Do they give you any soap?” inquired a hirsute individual who happened to be passing; and he stopped for a moment with the intention of moving on in the event of a reply in the negative.

“They do and all,” said someone sullenly. “An eighth of a cake apiece.”

The hairy individual hurriedly took his place in the queue.

"They're taking their time in there," said a grimy peasant in a tattered sheepskin who was constantly scratching himself and would persist in leaning against his neighbour, a tall anxious-looking gentleman. The latter kept looking round angrily at him and edging away, each time carefully scanning the sleeves of his overcoat.

"Are you letting us in soon? Giving 'em a good wash, ain't you?—Old woman, where are you a-shoving?"

"I'm joining the queue, lad."

"Have a tub with the menfolk, hey?"

"Is this the baths? There's a nice thing for me to do!" exclaimed the old woman, hastily glancing up at the signboard.

"Sheep's brains!"

"Not so fast with your sheep's brains! If folks will insist on going to the baths, they mustn't grumble if they have their pants pinched."

"Yes, that's what makes you nervous about going to the baths—such a lot of thieving. And then there's the lice."

"Lice is getting me down," said the peasant in the sheepskin, scratching his back by rolling his shoulderblades.

"Must you keep leaning on me?" cried the anxious-looking gentleman.

The peasant looked at him, moved away without a word, and blew his nose with two fingers and the skirt of his sheepskin.

"Regular getting me down," he repeated.

"And where do they hand out the soap?" asked the hairy man.

"Just inside."

"Been all over the town, couldn't find a bit anywhere. Now I shall have to have a bath, I suppose."

"One of these days, my lad, you'll pop in to get a bit of soap and find your trousers gone. Baths are the devil these days."

"Last time some chap had a bath—went back for his clothes and found 'em all gone. Didn't even leave him a pair of drawers. Had to borrow a skirt from the watchman's old woman—went home dressed as a shemale."

"Gave *him* a good washing, hey?" said the peasant in the sheepskin. "People hain't got things, so what can they do but steal? Now take this 'ere shirt of mine—been wearing it three months and more . . . Just 'ad to."

The anxious-looking gentleman, glancing round, shied away still further from the peasant.

"Stand closer together!" cried people at the back of the queue.



"What are you leaving a gap for? We're half-way across the road as it is!"

The peasant once more closed in on the gentleman.

"They're letting us in!" cried someone suddenly.

The door opened, and elbowing one another they all pressed towards it in a compact mass.

"Take your soap on the way in!"

"Can a chap have his soap without having a bath?" asked the hairy individual.

"No fear!"

"See I shall just have to have a bath. There's luck for you!"

"They know how to wangle it," said someone in the crowd.

"You don't want to go, and yet, somehow, you go."

"Do get a move on there! Jammed together like a flock of sheep, blocking up the doorway! Fine time to choose for 'eart-to-'eart talks!"

"Halt! That's enough!" said the man at the door. "Next batch must wait their turn."

"I knew it! Stand and wait all day in the perishing cold. . . And you can't get away if you wants to."

"Might as well go through with it now you're here. Keep away in future."

"And it be a pity to miss your bit of soap."

"Won't be so easy to keep away, neither. I hears as how they'll be driving us here once a fortnight."

"And folk put up with it! . . . What are we coming to?"

"We're too patient, that's what it is. If they tried it on some folks they'd soon learn what's what."

"Next batch!"

Pressing against one another they pushed through the open door.

The dressing-room swarmed with people taking their clothes off.

"Keep an eye on your things!" cried the attendant.

Everyone, suddenly hushed, looked anxiously at his neighbour, and some, turning aside to hide what they were doing, started to wrap things up.

"Devil take it!" said the hairy man, making his way to the wash-room. "They give you a scrap of soap hardly big enough to wash your head with, and there's none left to take home."

"Just act as if you was washing, sonny," said the grimy peasant. "That's my system. 'S the fourth time I've been here."

"There used to be hip-baths here and all sorts of gadgets," said a lad who was soaping his head. "You'd stand underneath, give

the handle a good pull, and down would come water—just like being in a shower of rain.”

“That thing’s still here, over by the wall there.”

“What are you tugging like that for?” cried the attendant to a well-built lad who stood under the shower pulling at the handle with both hands.

“Why don’t the water come?”

“Cause it’s out of order, stupid! Suppose you want to pull the whole blinking outfit to pieces. What a brain!”

“Stop it! Stop it! Now look what you’ve gone and done!” cried a man on the other side of the room, wiping his face with his hands and spluttering—a plump gentleman whose neighbour, while rinsing himself, had accidentally doused him with cold water. “Only just soaped myself, and you must go and wash it all off. And I’ve used up all my soap.”

The grimy peasant was sitting on his bench by a tub full of water. He gazed for a while attentively at the floor, and then said:

“To think of all the lice there must be splashing about!”

“What about washing for a change?” cried the attendant as he passed. “Sitting there, taking up room . . .”

The peasant looked round nervously, and with his black hands started splashing hot water from a basin on to his dry, matted hair.

“Just splash a bit for appearance sake,” he said, looking sideways at the hairy individual who was sitting next to him. “I shall take the soap home to my old woman, so she can give my shirts a bit of a wash.”

“The soap’s all a chap comes for,” agreed the hairy man, making a pretence of soaping his head as the attendant walked past.

“This cleanliness business is being carried a sight too far. They don’t give you a moment’s peace. Only last week they were making us clean out the courtyards.”

“Folks is patient, and so they gets put upon.”

“If they didn’t keep a sharp eye on the likes of you, you’d be turning into dung-heaps,” said a man with a military moustache who was sitting opposite the grimy peasant, squinting under his upraised arms as he soaped his head.

The peasant glanced cautiously at him, as though endeavouring to gauge his status, and said nothing.

“It’s lice, they say, as spreads typhus,” observed someone.

“Well, all I can say is I’ve got on with them all my life as comfortable as you like—queer they should have got so dangerous all of a sudden.”

“ ‘S right.”

“ They’ll be saying bugs spread cholera next ! ” observed a scornful voice.

A man sat smeared all over with clay and was kneading it into his hair. He was watched with interest for some time. Then the grimy peasant asked slowly :

“ For some sort of disease, is it ? ”

From beneath the hanging wet hair peered a pair of angry eyes.

“ What d’you mean—disease? Don’t talk bosh ! ”

“ Clay’s just the stuff to get out dirt of long standing,” said a thin man with a bruise on his leg. “ Used it myself last time I was here.”

“ Look sharp and wash ; you can talk at home,” cried the attendant. “ The next batch is getting impatient.”

All began to finse themselves industriously.

“ Yes, folks is certainly going to the dogs . . . ”

“ It’s looking after, they need,” said the man with the military moustache. “ Some folk have to be treated strict. What’s wanted is a proper campaign for cleanliness, and then—them as haven’t been to the baths for a month, no bread, and a spot of quod wouldn’t hurt either.”

“ What d’you mean—change and wash your blinking clothes every blinking week? Let them do it themselves before they starts ordering other people about.”

“ They don’t take people’s convenience into account. Know that folks are long-suffering, and put upon them. Paint placards of whacking great lice, stick ’em up all over the place, and don’t stop to think how the working man’s going to manage.”

“ Hang it all ! ” cried the hairy man. “ A spot of hot water splashed on it, and it’s gone and melted away like so much butter. Good-bye to my soap. Had a bath all for nothing.”

“ Look sharp and get out ! ” cried the attendant. “ Other folks are waiting, and you sit there and chatter. What’s this? Supposed to have had a bath, and your feet are as black as pitch,” he said, stopping before the grimy peasant.

“ Somehow they just won’t seem to come clean, lad. Next time I’ll try a bit of clay.”

And as the attendant moved off, the grimy peasant added :

“ Not content with keeping you here by force for ’arf an hour, they comes poking their noses at your feet. And folks put up with it . . . ”

## II

## A HOSPITABLE FOLK

The train carrying soldiers from Turkestan halted at a small wayside station, and there it stayed for twenty-four hours.

"You freeze like a dog," said a thin soldier in a torn greatcoat, huddling up and hiding his hands in his sleeves. "No clothes, no firewood neither," he added, peering round him. "Hey, sonny, you don't happen to have a stick or two of firewood to spare?"

"Sorry," answered the passing railway watchman. He stopped and looked at the soldiers. "The spare sleepers have all been burnt up—by soldiers, you know—and the boarding too."

The watchman proving affable and talkative, they lit up their pipes and started chatting.

"So all that's left for us is the fences like?" said another soldier in a short-sleeved, ill-fitting jacket.

"In a manner of speaking . . ."

"Whose fence is that over there?"

"Belongs to a chap living in these parts."

"Well, can't be helped; we shall just have to pull it down. Nothing else left."

"A lot of traffic on this line," said the watchman. "We used to have plenty of everything, but it's all been cleaned up. Well, don't make too much row breaking down the fence; meanwhile I'll just step round the other side. Bit awkward otherwise; it's really my job to keep an eye on stuff. The old man himself isn't here—drove into town, and won't be back before nightfall."

The soldiers set to work. The fenceboards creaked as they were twisted from their rotting supports. Five minutes later they were all sitting on the other side of the coaches, on the roadbed which was splashed with black oil, as it always is near stations, warming themselves at the fire.

"Manage all right?" asked the watchman, coming up again.

"First rate. Painted wood burns fine."

"You won't find better," agreed the watchman.

"Snow-fences ain't bad either."

"There aren't any left—there's nothing left for that matter."

"Lord, what times we're having!" said someone, and sighed.

They were all silent for a while.

"The old man will wake up tomorrow and find his fence gone."

"It'll improve his outlook—the fence kept the light from his windows," said the soldier with the short sleeves.

"If he'd caught us in the act, I bet he'd have kicked up no end of fuss—called in the militia, I shouldn't be surprised."

"No," said the watchman. "They've got used to it now; just grins and bears it."

"Got resigned like?"

• "As you might say . . . Especially if it's done decently. Now it's my job, in a manner of speaking, to keep an eye on property; but you've behaved decent, and me—not a word."

"We're from Turkestan, you know; there things turned out just the other way round. To start with, the folks there was simply first-rate. You see, they've got a sort of law, so that if a guest calls on you—a soldier, say—you must give him food and drink, all for nothing."

"For nothing?" said the watchman, and shuffled away on his haunches from the smoke, so as to listen undisturbed.

"For nothing."

"A hospitable folk, I see."

"You've said it."

"And you haven't heard it all yet. They've another sort of law that if a guest praises, let's say, his host's coat, supposing it happens to take his fancy, then he has to hand it over."

"To the guest?"

"S' right."

The other soldiers sat round the fire in silence, poking it now and then with sticks, like people familiar with all this. Around them the autumn night was black, and the lights of the lonely halt gleamed dully.

"There's people for you! And did you . . . make the most of your chances?"

"Not half we didn't," answered the thin soldier gloomily. "But the brass hats interfered and took a lot of the stuff back."

"But why, if that's the law?"

"Ask me another!"

"You know, we used to have a good blow-out, buckshee, and then start praising right and left; that's a fine coat you've got, and so on."

"And you didn't feel at all uncomfortable?"

"Why at first, of course, we didn't take very much—felt a bit awkward about it."

"It was not being used to the idea, that's what it was."

"Yes, we hadn't quite cottoned on . . . Then, when you saw that everybody had got the idea, you hadn't time to pick and

choose; it was a case of praising everything you could lay hands on."

"And how did they take it?" asked the watchman, greatly interested.

"Why, what could they do, seeing as how that's the law? O' course, they wasn't too pleased, I can tell you."

"But they kept to the law all the same?"

"Uhuh. They're good folk, understand what's what. And so, laddie, we cleaned 'em out good and proper. At first, when they saw you passing, they'd ask you in and feed you up fit to bust, and then sit and wait for you to start a-praising."

"Acshally waiting for it? There's folk for you!"

"But later on, when we started carting their stuff off by the ton, they weren't quite so anxious to have us in."

"Started breaking the law, as you might say?"

"Well, seeing as how we was cleaning them out of house and home . . ."

"Anyone would get fed up giving his own stuff away by the handful," said the soldier with the short sleeves.

"Didn't leave 'em so much as a blanket apiece," continued the thin soldier. "And all according to the law, you know; not as if we'd been doing the dirty like."

"If people treat you decent, you has to treat them decent," observed the watchman.

"'S right. Only we didn't do so badly, treating 'em decent as you put it. Later on, though, things got quite different. Sometimes you'd be praising some mangy little sheep, and the old man would go as deaf as a post all of a sudden. That's when we started pinching stuff . . ."

"They was getting too civilised, as you might say."

"Yes. And they weren't long in tumbling to how they must treat the likes of us. Just snaffle a few odds and ends, and the old man would be wanting to drag you off to the commissar."

"Well, well, how folk can change!"

Suddenly, near the house from which the fence had been stolen, the creaking of cartwheels sounded through the darkness. Then the noise ceased, as though the driver had lost his way and stopped to get his bearings. An exclamation rang out.

"Lord preserve us! Where have I got to? Lived here all my life, and gone and got lost! Hey, you there! What station is this?"

"Say it's Arsenyev," whispered the watchman. "I'd better clear off; it's the old man in person. He knows me."

"Arsenyev," cried the soldier with the short sleeves.

"What the . . . ! How the . . . !" sounded from the house. A minute later there appeared in the light of the fire a man in a sleeveless overcoat carrying a whip.

"Must be going crazy in my old age; lost my way in the dark, and now I can't find my own house!"

"Ain't been doing *this*, I suppose?" asked the thin soldier, cocking his elbow meaningly as he peered through the smoke at the newcomer.

The latter made no reply, but continued to look about him with a puzzled expression.

"Everything's in its right place," he muttered; then suddenly, perceiving the remains of his fence at his feet, he scratched his temple and moved off again without a word. Not till he was some ten paces away was he heard to spit angrily.

"Has he gone?" asked the watchman from the other side of the train.

"Yes . . . He's found his house. Thought he'd recognise it by the fence, and went astray like," said the soldier with the short sleeves.

"Didn't he say nothing?" continued the watchman.

"Never a word. Just spit. And that when he was some way off."

"Well, well, how folks can change! Not so very long ago, if you'd 've done a thing like that, he'd 've carted you off to the police-station, besides beating you black and blue. And now . . . just as though nothing had happened."

"They've got out of the way of it. Been taught a new religion like," said the soldier with the short sleeves.

"They've got out of the way, and others are getting into the way . . ."

"Turn and turn about, as you might say," concluded the watchman.

### III

#### THE SPECULATORS

The station was crowded with people rushing to and fro. A queue was forming by the booking-office; and as there wasn't room for it to keep straight, it twisted in a spiral and sprawled all over the place.

The hall was filled with the yelling and wailing of infants, nearly every woman having one in her arms; and for some reason the little things were specially restless.

And outside, by the station wall, stood a row of peasant women with infants in their arms. They seemed in no hurry to get into the station, had no luggage with them, were offering no goods for sale. Yet people were crowding round them just as they do round the women who congregate at stations to sell eggs, sausage and bread.

"What are you hanging around here for?" cried a militia-man. "If you want tickets, go into the station; if not, clear off!"

The women moved reluctantly into the station.

The wailing of infants grew even more ear-splitting.

"Where on earth do they all come from, confound 'em?" said a workman with a sack of potatoes who had had to take his place at the extreme end of the queue, right by the door.

One young woman even had two infants with her. One she was holding in her arms, while the other she had placed in its little blanket on the floor by the wall.

"Say, you haven't been wasting your time, have you? Can't even hold 'em all at once! Here, who are you a-shoving of?"

"Can't help it in this crowd—do shut up, you little beast!" cried the woman at her infant.

"Never seen so many before in all my life! Where *do* they all come from? What have they took it into their heads to go travelling for, all of a sudden?"

"And every one of them with a kid. I reckon there won't be enough tickets to go round."

"Shouldn't be surprised if half of us have to stay here till tomorrow. The ones with the kids are all right, though; they get tickets out of their turn."

"Hang it, if I'd known I'd have brought my own brat along," said a woman in a sheepskin.

"All you've got to do is to go and ask for one from those women standing by the wall."

"But will they let me have one?"

"Why shouldn't they? That's what they're here for."

"For money, lad, they'll give you anything these days," said an old man in grey felt boots.

The woman went up to those standing by the door and, coming back, reported:



"They're asking four thousand . . ."

"Why, the shameless hussies, yesterday the price was only three thousand!" exclaimed an old woman.

"Wrap a cat up in a fur coat, and you'll get your ticket out of turn; they'll think it's a kid."

"Have to wrap it up jolly careful; they've started feeling to make sure."

"When I saw you just now, you hadn't got a kid with you," cried the militia-man at a woman by the booking-office window. "Where's it come from so suddenly?"

"Where do you think kids come from?" snapped the woman.

"All right, all right! Those with kids can move forward."

"The place is simply swarming with 'em. Fine chance you 'as of getting a ticket. And where *do* they all come from? Effect of the war or something? Nothing but brats all over the shop. That old hag over there—even she's got a kid. Crikey, who can ever have taken a fancy to her? Must 'ave been crazy!"

"Folk don't bother to pick and choose these days."

"Now they've gone and drove me right back to the door again," said the workman, and spat in disgust.

"Take one of my kids, mate, and then they'll let you through out of turn," said the woman with the two infants.

"Seems like I shall have to. How much are you asking?"

"Same price as everybody else: four thousand. On a market day we should be asking five."

"Got a cheek, ain't you, asking all that?" said the workman, putting his sack down to count out the money.

"Well, everybody else is doing the same."

The workman handed over the money, and took the infant in his arms.

"Careful, now; mind you keep him right end up!"

And the woman took her spare child from the floor.

"Twins, dearie?" asked the woman next to her.

"No, this is my sister-in-law's kid. She's fallen sick, so I've taken it over. We splits the proceeds."

"Half and half like," said the old man, and winked.

"What are they charging for the kids?" people in the crowd were asking in whispers.

"Four thou'."

"Like their cheek! Ready to squeeze the last halfpenny out of you, the confounded speculators. Why yesterday their price was only three thousand!"

"Three thousand . . . and what's the price of bread?"

"Yes, they ain't 'arf putting their prices up. Only last week I was travelling with my son's wife, and we got a brace of kids for five thousand. What are things coming to?"

"Kids is certainly rising in price," said the old man, shaking his head. "Nowadays, if your old woman knows her business, all you has to do is to rake in the cash."

"Lord, they've all been snapped up in ten minutes!"

"Nothing like the scramble there is on a market day; you ought to see it."

"And there's an old woman with one eye, pushing her way in with a three-year-old. Who'd take a hulking brute like that?"

"You would, if you was in a hurry."

"Dare say I would, now."

"Never seen such a crowd before," muttered the militia-man, nonplussed. "There's more out of the queue than in it. And look at the queue, twisting round like a blinking serpent. Hey, you! Untwist yourselves! And you, young fellow me lad," he cried at the workman, "where do you think you're pushing? Go to the back of the queue; this part's only for women."

"I've got a kid with me . . ."

"Oh, devil take you! All right, stand here then."

"What are you holding him upside down for?" cried the young woman, running up to the workman. "Must be cracked; anybody would think you'd never held a kid in your life before!"

"He's paid his money, you see, and so he thinks . . ."

The booking-office window opened. The queue pressed forward in a tightly-packed, agitated mass. A market woman carrying a tin box came hurrying along, tried to get to the ticket window, and was sent to the end of the queue. Up to her came the one-eyed woman with the three-year-old. The market woman tested his weight on her arms, and was about to refuse; but then, waving her hand in despair, she wrapped the little boy up in her shawl, hiding him completely, and moved to the front of the queue again.

"So you got rid of him at last?" said an old woman in a kerchief sympathetically to the woman with one eye.

"Yes; but they'll only take him when there ain't no other kids left," said the one-eyed woman angrily. "On market-days it's not too bad, of course; but other days it's 'eart-breaking."

"It's his weight, you know. Stand holding him for an hour, and your arms are ready to break."

"Hey, where are my children?" cried the young woman with two.

"Have to keep your eyes open these days! A woman had her kid pinched just like that, a day or two ago."

"Here he is—here I am!" cried the workman, standing on tiptoe to reveal his whereabouts in the queue.

"And is the other one there?"

"They're both alive and kicking. We're family people ourselves."

"That's the stuff to give 'em, girls," called a Red Army man, looking at the endless queue of women with babies. "Do your bit for the Red Army!"

"Yes, the women knows what's expected of them."

The workman, having received his ticket, came back to hand over the child.

"Hang it, look what he's done to my coat!"

"Don't worry, it'll easily wipe off."

"It's bad enough for a grown-up to have to wait about here for hours on end; what can you expect of a mere infant?"

"Where's the mother of this brat?" cried a woman rushing anxiously about with a child in her arms. "She's gone, the devil!"

The market woman came running up to the woman with one eye and said, angrily shoving the child into her arms:

"They won't pass a great brute like this. And all through you I've lost my place in the queue."

The old man in felt boots looked at her, and said:

"Why don't you try wrapping your father-in-law up in a shawl and bringing *him* along?"

## CZECHOSLOVAKIA—THE KEY TO THE DANUBIAN BASIN

WHENEVER today Czechoslovakia is discussed either in conversation or in print, prime if not exclusive consideration is given to the problem of the Sudeten-Germans. This is comprehensible, as the question has suddenly come to the fore with dangerous urgency and has become the centre of most serious international interest. Since the Führer has proclaimed himself publicly the protector of all Germans wherever they live and has included in the area of his immediate interest 10 million Germans living in two neighbouring states (he had in mind the Germans in Austria before the annexation and the Germans in Czechoslovakia), the Sudeten German problem has necessarily become a matter of international politics, even though it still remains an internal problem of Czechoslovakia. In spite of the urgency of this question which today engages the chancelleries of numerous states, it would be a mistake to suppose that the Czechoslovak question can be comprehended in these terms.

I shall not discuss the Sudeten German problem in detail here. Enough has been written about it both in the English and the French press. I shall content myself with emphasising its main political aspects. Today it should be obvious to the whole world that the desire of German policy to gain so-called "equality" for the Sudeten Germans is less concerned with the actual conditions among the latter than would appear at first sight. In reality they are merely an excellent tool for the aims of the dynamic policy of the Third Reich, which wants to extend the so-called German "living space" into the Danubian basin and the Balkans. / It is superfluous to repeat that in the whole of Europe there is no minority enjoying greater rights, more civic liberties and greater political influence than the German minority in Czechoslovakia. It is also superfluous to repeat how strangely the intense German interest in the Sudeten Germans contrasts with their present indifference to the fate of the other German minorities in Poland, Hungary, Yugoslavia and especially Italy. Konrad Henlein, the leader of the Sudeten German party, in a speech at Carlsbad on 24 April stated with rare frankness the real point at issue. He then demanded not only territorial and personal autonomy, but also a revision of Czechoslovak foreign policy and a recognition of the right of the Sudeten Germans to profess freely National Socialism and to govern

their affairs according to this political creed. It is unnecessary to argue whether this speech proclaimed a maximum or a minimum programme. It is not impossible that German policy subsequently recognised the tactical error involved in these statements, and that it tried to minimise their immediate effect. Konrad Henlein during his visit to London last May took this line. But nobody who has studied Hitler's policy with any care can have the slightest doubt that the demands of Henlein express quite clearly the actual aims of National Socialist policy in regard to Czechoslovakia. Assuredly a fulfilment of these demands would satisfy the Third Reich! The establishment of autonomy to the extent desired by Henlein and his followers would mean the creation of a very peculiar and almost completely independent sub-state inside Czechoslovakia: and as inside this unit the Henlein party, openly professing Nazism, would have a decisive majority, the policy of this anomalous sub-state would be entirely subject to the direction and wishes of Berlin. The revision of Czechoslovak foreign policy demanded by Henlein amounts in practice to a wish that Czechoslovakia should give up her treaties of alliance with France and Russia and—as was declared in so many words by a deputy of the Sudeten German party in the Prague Parliament—accept a place in the “German sphere” (Lebensraum). Lastly, the profession of National Socialism, based as it is on principles of race and totalitarianism, is quite irreconcilable with the democratic principles on which the whole political and social structure of Czechoslovakia has been built. In practice the Germans, in their sub-state, could introduce the anti-Semitic laws of the Reich and suppress all other political parties. In such a way, the whole inner coherence of Czechoslovakia would be disturbed, and her internal and external resistance to aggression broken. All these demands mean, in one word, nothing less than that Czechoslovakia should submit to the Third Reich and become the vassal of Germany.

As no nation is ready to commit suicide voluntarily, it is obvious that no satisfactory solution of the Sudeten German problem can be found on the basis suggested by Henlein and Hitler. An agreement which is desired by all Czechoslovak parties and by all shades of political opinion, from the extreme right to the extreme left, is only possible if at least two absolutely fundamental principles are respected:—

- (1) The indivisibility of the state, which has been established and maintained only on a democratic basis.
- (2) The external independence of the republic.

These conditions, which must appear fair to everybody who has any understanding for the desire of every nation to live its own free life, are surely not incompatible with a reasonable compromise, assuming goodwill on the German side. Within these limits it is quite possible to extend and secure all the rights and political influence of the Germans in Czechoslovakia in conformity with their numbers and importance. Today we know enough of the principles of the "Nationality Charter" which the Czechoslovak government has been preparing and which is now being discussed with the Sudeten Germans to be able to summarise its principles as follows :—

(1) The language rights of the minority nations will be increased so considerably as to guarantee a full and consistent equality in the official use of language.

(2) Local self-government in communes and districts will be extended to such a degree that the minority nations, wherever they have a majority in the locality, will be able to administer their local affairs quite independently.

(3) There will be self-government in the administration of schools and other cultural matters.

(4) A just share in the budget will be guaranteed to all Minorities in matters directly affecting their national interests, whether in the cultural, social or economic field.

(5) The principle of numerical proportion will be carried out in the appointment of officials and employees in the state administration and in all public enterprises. As far as possible the officials and employees of the various minorities will be placed in districts where their own nationality is in the majority.

Every objective observer must admit that a real and complete equality of all the nationalities living in Czechoslovakia, and especially of the Germans, is assured by the proposals. Czechoslovakia will become a State of absolute justice and equality for all nationalities. It will compare favourably even with the Swiss example of national tolerance, though, of course, the structure of Switzerland will still be different from that of Czechoslovakia, since it is impossible to transfer the whole of the political and administrative institutions of one state to another.

It is, of course, a question whether Berlin will be satisfied with these far-reaching structural reforms which Czechoslovakia is planning and which she intends to carry out consistently. It certainly would be satisfied, if the real aim were to secure the Sudeten Germans all just rights, and a reasonable share in political power.

If, however, Germany continues to use the Sudeten Germans merely as a means of exerting pressure and causing disruption, the ultimate aim being to impose a surrender of independence and submission to German domination—then even the most far-reaching concessions will prove inadequate. Probably the near future will give a definite answer to this question.

It cannot be denied that Czechoslovakia is prepared to go to the limits of possible concession, as her contribution to the preservation of European peace. But beyond the limits stated above we cannot go, as this would mean the disintegration of our State and the undermining of its external independence. Whoever asks us to go beyond these limits must meet with absolute refusal. Nothing can shake our determination to defend our national liberty and independence to the last drop of blood. The aggressor must know that Czechoslovakia when attacked will defend herself with determination, even if certain that she would receive no help from other states. Any self-respecting nation will prefer an honourable death to cowardice and slavery.

We fully share with our British and French friends the apprehension that Europe may become engulfed in a new war. It is certainly the duty of all honourable and decent people to do all in their power to avert war. For this very reason, we are trying, even at considerable risk, to carry out a rapid reconstruction of nationality rights, though under normal conditions a slower pace would have been advisable. But we cannot and will not go beyond the limits which are compatible with the preservation of our national liberty and independence.

I know that there are people in the West who think that the easiest solution might be for Czechoslovakia to surrender the districts inhabited by a majority of Sudeten Germans, and that European peace would thus be preserved, if not permanently, at any rate for a long period. But such hopes can be cherished only by those who still think that it is merely a question of the Sudeten Germans and fail to understand the real issues at stake. It is only necessary to glance at a map showing the geographical distribution of the Czechoslovaks and the Sudeten Germans, especially in Bohemia and Moravia, to see the impossibility of such a solution. It is true that the frontier districts are largely inhabited by Sudeten Germans, but at several points the Czechs reach the frontier, so that this area is neither ethnically uniform nor even geographically connected. The Czechs and Germans are so much intermixed that it is simply impossible to draw a clear frontier between them,

based on ethnic lines: and this without taking into account the German and Czech "islands" or *enclaves* in otherwise purely Czech or German surroundings.

This is best illustrated by a few statistics. According to the 1930 census there are 3,231,688 Germans in Czechoslovakia living in the frontier districts: but these are interrupted by stretches of territory inhabited by Czechs, so that the mainly German area falls into 8 distinct regions, lacking contact with each other save through Czech territory, of whom some 2,495,633 are Germans. Besides this, there are 736,025 Germans in districts with a Czech majority, while in these eight frontier districts there live 440,561 Czechs and 10,458 members of other nationalities. A territorial autonomy is simply impossible, since no continuous area could be created. Even the joining of these areas to Germany is impossible in practice. Emil Sobota in his book "National Autonomy in Czechoslovakia" says well on this point: "If the frontier districts which have a majority of Germans should be annexed to Germany, a new frontier would be created which would be wholly impossible even from the administrative point of view. In such a case together with 2,321,847 Germans, 399,215 Czechs would be annexed by Germany, while 909,841 Germans would still remain in what was left of Czechoslovakia. If the frontier were to be drawn in such a way as to include not only the whole border districts but also the German islands which do not form a continuous territory with the mainly German districts, then several districts with a Czech majority would have to be annexed to Germany." In that event 2,610,387 Germans and 676,471 Czechs would be annexed by Germany, but there would still remain 621,301 Germans in Czechoslovakia. If the present state of affairs is not considered entirely just, a far less just situation would thereby be created. But the main argument against the annexation of the frontier districts inhabited by a majority of Germans to Germany is the fact that after such a partition what remained of Czechoslovakia would also very soon come under German rule. Czechoslovakia would simply be deprived of the indispensable geographical and above all economic postulates of independence. The very roots of Czechoslovak liberty would have been cut. Bohemia and Moravia form in their present shape, which has not changed since the Middle Ages, an organic geographical economic and political unity. Economically the several districts of these countries are so interdependent that its prosperity would completely collapse if their coherence were destroyed. Whatever we may think about frontiers in general, there can be no doubt,



at least as far as the present frontier between Czechoslovakia and Germany is concerned, that it was not an artificial creation, but was predestined by geographical and economic conditions and that it stood the test of centuries.

Anyone who suggests that the present dispute could be solved by the break-up of this geographical, economic, political and historical unity must also accept the unavoidable consequences of such a step : it would mean that Czechoslovakia would either disappear altogether from the map of Europe or would become a mere vassal of Greater Germany.

But from this there follow further unavoidable consequences : it opens up the path to German expansion throughout the Danubian and Balkan regions with all their rich resources of raw materials, both agricultural and industrial. Germany would then dispose not only of the great metallurgical industry of Czechoslovakia, whose productive capacity exceeds that of the heavy industry of Italy, but also of Hungarian, Yugoslav and Roumanian wheat, of the rich Czechoslovak coal-fields, Yugoslav iron-ore and Roumanian oil. And since in all these countries the capacity of production has considerably increased since the war in comparison with the production of the former Austria-Hungary, the economic, political and military potential power of Greater Germany, increased by its control of the Danubian and Balkan area, would be enormously greater than that of pre-war Germany in conjunction with its Austro-Hungarian ally.

The crux of the Czechoslovak problem, which is today quite literally, a European problem, is not the local question of the Sudeten Germans, but the key-position which Czechoslovakia holds in the Danube basin. Bismarck understood this when he said that the master of Bohemia is also the master of Europe. It is possible to solve the Sudetan question by a fair compromise between the legitimate demands of the Germans and the necessary conditions of Czechoslovak liberty. But the problem becomes insoluble, if the Sudeten Germans are merely used as an instrument to achieve the destruction of Czechoslovakia, either by a direct attack or by such internal and external weakening of her position as to reduce her to the status of a German vassal. It is obvious to anyone who can think out the consequences of any political action that this would necessarily upset not only the Danubian, but literally the whole European, balance of power. Czechoslovakia, while aiming at internal consolidation, has always sought guarantees of her independence in a foreign policy firmly based on the principles of the

League of Nations, and in a system of alliances with France and Russia, and with the Little Entente. Without these guarantees she would be isolated. She could not, as a state of 15,500,000 inhabitants, preserve her independence in face of the 73 millions of Greater Germany. We should certainly welcome the idea of Czechoslovak neutrality if it were possible to guarantee it. But it is very doubtful whether any such international guarantee could be made effective. This beautiful dream will, we fear, remain a mere utopia in present circumstances. Colonel Moravec in his paper "The importance and strength of Czechoslovakia" remarks quite rightly that even those States which are striving today for neutrality have to enhance their security by military preparations. Besides, it is "absolutely impossible to remain neutral in a struggle in which the greatest questions of world politics are at stake, especially for a state which is situated on an important military crossroad." Czechoslovakia is such a State, at a point where the political, cultural, and military interests of Europe meet. Under these circumstances the only foreign policy by which she can protect her independence, is one of European collaboration, which on the one hand tries unceasingly to reach a friendly agreement with all her neighbours and especially Germany, and on the other supports a system of security based on alliance and friendship with those states which have common interests with her.

Czechoslovakia does not, however, rely only on the help which she could receive from her allies and friends, but first and foremost on her own strength. Even if this strength is not sufficient to repel a possible German attack, it is at least sufficient to check aggression in cooperation with the forces of her allies and friends. It would be an error to think that it is an easy military enterprise to annihilate Czechoslovakia: this would require about 3 million men, and it may be useful to present at least a partial picture of her potential military resources.

The economic resources of Czechoslovakia do not appear to be generally known. It may surprise many readers to learn that the war industry of Czechoslovakia is bigger than that of Italy, and that in 1937 she produced 90 per cent. more pig iron and 15 per cent. more steel than Italy. Leaving aside Russia, Czechoslovakia is among the six main industrial states in Europe (the other 5 being Germany, Britain, France, Italy and Belgium). In the East Central European region, from the Baltic to the Aegean, 3 million tons of pig iron and 4,700,000 tons of steel were produced in 1937: but of this total Czechoslovakia produced 1,700,000 and 2,300,000

tons respectively. Her heavy industry produced more than the corresponding industries in all the other 11 East Central European states combined, including Poland. If Germany should control Czechoslovakia, she would immediately acquire more than half of the technical war power of the whole Eastern part of Central Europe. One must further consider that about 1,500,000 tons of iron and steel are produced annually in Hungary, Roumania, Jugoslavia and Bulgaria, and out of this total more than one million tons of iron and steel came from Hungary alone. Jugoslavia, Roumania and Bulgaria, countries which together have 38 million inhabitants, produce only half a million tons of iron and steel, or one-eighth of the Czechoslovak output. It is no exaggeration to say that if Czechoslovakia were controlled by Germany, the productive capacity of the other states from the Baltic to the Black and Aegean Seas would be quite insufficient to supply these countries with armaments. Czechoslovakia alone can supply the whole war material of the other two members of the Little Entente, and that of several other states of the East Central European region as well. We must not forget that, in addition to her heavy industry, she has very important chemical industries also, and their capacity far exceeds the production of all the other Central European states, outside Germany. The Germans are therefore entitled to call Czechoslovakia the arsenal of Europe.

We cannot, of course, quote exact figures as to the military power of the state, as these are kept a close secret. But we can quote a German estimate of the Czechoslovak effectives, which is presumably accurate, as the Germans have no reason to exaggerate Czechoslovak resources. According to this, we have the following trained reserves: in active units (with officers and non-commissioned officers) 200,000 men: as first reserve, 1 million men; as second reserve, 300,000 men—total, 1,500,000 men. There are about 500,000 untrained men of 18 and 19, in the first and second reserve, and lastly we could get together some 200,000 men for non-combatant services between the ages of 50 and 60. It is calculated, therefore, that Czechoslovakia could call about 2,000,000 men to the colours, and that her army on a war footing would amount to 24 divisions of infantry, 4 "Alpine" brigades, and 4 cavalry brigades. "Markomannus," in his book *Brennpunkt Böhmen*, published in 1935, even assumes that Czechoslovakia could put into the field as many as 32 infantry divisions, besides the 4 "Alpine" and 4 cavalry brigades.

Generals Niessel and Baratier estimated the German armed

forces on land at 60 first line divisions and 30 divisions of militia for frontier defence in 1937: and a further 60 divisions could be mobilised in two weeks' time. In 1937 Germany could put into the field an army of 150 divisions, as her population amounted to 66 millions. Since the annexation of Austria Germany has 73 million inhabitants, and has created 4 new army corps, of which two (of 12 divisions each) are in Austria. We have to reckon with the possibility of Germany mobilising no less than 170 divisions within a month. This means that for every million inhabitants there could be 2 to 3 divisions. If the same proportions held good in regard to Czechoslovakia, she would be able to mobilise 35 divisions, which corresponds roughly with the view of "Markomannus." In any case she can mobilise the same proportion of divisions as Germany, and as her armaments industry compares well both in quality and quantity with the German, her army should be at least as well equipped as the German. With 73 millions against 15½, the ratio between Germany and Czechoslovakia could be expressed by 4.5 : 1, i.e. Czechoslovakia would be able to engage about one-fifth of all the German forces. In August 1914 Russia went to the help of France with forces which can be estimated at about 30 divisions of present-day strength: and this is about the same help which Czechoslovakia could offer to France in case of a future possible war.

We must also mention the air force. The Germans have called Czechoslovakia an aircraft carrier anchored in the heart of Germany. In the booklet above quoted "Markomannus" writes: "If Germany should be engaged in war with France, the menacing position of Bohemia and Moravia may have very disagreeable consequences. Czechoslovakia has a very efficient aircraft industry which could produce thousands of planes during war time. The Czechoslovak air force is a menace to Berlin, Dresden and Leipzig." "Markomannus" also points out that "from Strasbourg to Prague the distance of 600 kilometers could be flown in two hours, and the French air force could bomb the southern parts of Germany on the way." We may add that Soviet Russia is only 150 kilometers from the Czechoslovak frontier and that from the most easterly point of the frontier there are only 750 kilometers to Prague, so that Russian aircraft could arrive in Prague within three hours.

The Germans are, obviously, much interested in the Czechoslovak air force. K. Urban in his book *Kurze Zusammenstellung über die tschechoslovakische Armee*, published in June 1937 at Berlin, estimates that while Czechoslovakia had in 1933 some 750 aeroplanes for

military use, in 1937 she had 1,500, and of these the following were first line : 240 reconnaissance, 265 pursuit, 135 bombers, 120 reserve, 240 training and 10 "battle" aircraft, altogether about 1,000 aircraft of the first line and 500 of the second. In 1937 the Germans estimated the Czechoslovak air force personnel and the supporting ground staff at 10,000 men. Foreign observers have estimated the German air force at some 80,000 to 100,000 men, the British at 70,000 and the Russian at 150,000 men. These estimates were made in the middle of the year 1937 : and it is obvious that Czechoslovakia has not been idle since then in the building up of her air force. The same is true of the increased motorisation of the army. Urban in 1937 counted the following mobile units :—11 cavalry regiments, 3 tank regiments and 4 motor-cycle regiments. The German handbook, *Die Rüsting der Welt*, published in 1935, listed under Czechoslovakia 71 heavy batteries and 175 light ones, under France 298 and 320, under Poland 98 and 318. These figures estimating the forces in 1934 are, of course, far exceeded today.

The well-known Czech military writer, Colonel Emanuel Moravec, summarises the progress of Czechoslovak rearmament during the last 4 years in these words : " One must, first of all, take into account the greater strategic mobility which has been achieved by improvements in communications (both by railway and road), especially between the so-called "historic" lands (Bohemia and Moravia) and Slovakia, and by the fortification of the frontiers. During these 4 years the Czechoslovak army has increased its mobility by adding to its motorisation and by increasing the number of mobile units (cavalry, motorcycle and tank) : and aircraft has been increased by leaps and bounds. As to tactics, the Czechoslovak army has gained in its new equipment a greater power of resistance also in defence against mobile units, tanks and aircraft."

Even if German propaganda chooses to make light of the military resources of Czechoslovakia, her preparedness and capacity for defence, serious German military experts have a high opinion of her army and make no secret of it. "Markomannus" says : "Czechoslovakia, in the event of war, is for Germany such a danger that it would be the best solution, if Bohemia could be cracked like a large nut by pincers. But the centre of the nut is the tough Czech nation which has a large army equipped with modern weapons." Colonel Moravec's comment is, "The cracking of the Czech nut will be a pretty difficult job." "Markomannus," while mentioning the military virtues shown by the Czech Hussites in the Middle Ages and by the Czechoslovak legionaries in Russia, forgot to say that

both waited until they were attacked. The Hussite invasions of Germany were an answer to the German crusades into Bohemia. The reflections of "Markomannus" are now more than two years old. In the meantime Austria has been annexed and the southern wing of the German Czechoslovak frontier has been moved eastward by 200 kilometers. The pincer attack recommended by "Markomannus" today offers much better chances for the Germans so far as their base of operations is concerned, but during the last two years powerful barriers against an invasion have been erected in the shape of fortifications along the frontiers both of Prussian Silesia and of Austria. These Czechoslovak frontier fortifications are, of course, not only confined to these two sectors, but now cover the whole frontiers between the Republic and the Reich.

These facts suffice to show that Czechoslovakia has larger resources and possibilities of self-defence than is usually assumed, and that her military and economic resources would considerably increase the power of Germany, if ever Czechoslovakia should pass under her control.

Czechoslovakia's European importance lies in the fact that she is quite literally the gateway to the Danubian basin and the Balkans, and thus the main bulwark of the independence of the Danubian and Balkan nations. It has been her policy ever since the early years after the war to consolidate the international situation created by the peace treaties in the Danube basin. This indeed was the main purpose for which the Little Entente was founded.

Up to the year 1935 the Little Entente was drawing more and more closely together (the pact of organisation concluded on 16 February, 1933, is the clearest expression of this tendency); but since then this progress has been arrested. All three States—especially Yugoslavia, and to a less degree Roumania—were profoundly impressed by the crisis in Franco-British policy, which resulted in failure as regards the Abyssinian question and in acquiescence as regards the reoccupation of the Rhineland. But the policy of France and Britain in the Spanish question was also interpreted, especially in Yugoslavia, as a sign of weakness and vacillation on the part of the two great Western powers: while German propaganda has interpreted this policy as a continuous retreat before the dynamic policy of the dictators. Yugoslavia drew the conclusion that a policy of the free hand is best under the circumstances: and this found expression in her new pact of friendship with Italy in March 1937. None the less, the Little Entente preserves its coherence in all questions concerning the actual

seas (the Euxine, the Caspian, the Mediterranean, the Red and the Indian Ocean) to be the entrance hall to the Indian Ocean and India, then the Balkan Entente is the main staircase to this entrance hall, and the Little Entente the garden wall. Czechoslovakia represents the gate. Whoever breaks open the gate, will get into the staircase and eventually into the entrance hall. Both Ententes today control the transversal axis from Europe to Asia (between Hamburg and Basra on the Persian Gulf) in its central section which amounts to about two-thirds of its length. The North-western part, about 800 kilometers, is controlled by Germany since the "Anschluss"; the central part, 2,200 kilometers in length, by the Little and Balkan Entente; and the South-Eastern sector, 1,000 kilometers long, by Great Britain. The Little and the Balkan Ententes are a powerful stabilising force in the Europe of today, and one of the main pillars of the balance of power. If they should yield to pressure, which would show along the transversal European-Asiatic axis, not only frontier stones will be moved in Europe, but a new division of the world will begin."

✓ Germany gained an important advantage by penetrating through the annexation of Austria deep into the Danubian basin and by getting within easy reach of the Adriatic Sea and the Balkans. Since then the key-position which Czechoslovakia occupies in Central Europe is even more obvious. Without her Yugoslavia and Roumania could not defend the Danubian basin or check its domination by Germany. Left to their own resources, they could not cope with the task, and Germany would become master not only of the Danube, but of the Balkans. It may indeed be said that Czechoslovakia plays in world politics a similar role to Turkey or Greece: for these states situated respectively on the northern and southern pole of the Danube-Balkan axis, occupy a key-position at one or the other extreme. The European balance of power would be irretrievably lost, if the smaller states of this region were to become the vassals of any Great Power. The preservation of their independence is not only in their own interest, but also in the common interest. The best means towards preservation of their independence is a strengthening of the Little and Balkan Ententes, which might be joined by Hungary and Bulgaria at a later stage.

It is not yet necessary to give up hope of at least reaching such a rapprochement between Hungary and the Little Entente as would make Hungary much more capable of resisting the external and internal pressure of German Nazism. The negotiations in this sense which have been going on since the summer of 1937

have been conducted between Hungary and the Little Entente, have not been abandoned, and even the annexation of Austria did not involve their failure. The fact that Hungary has now become the direct neighbour of Germany, has, of course, increased the German pressure upon her; but there is also a growing fear in Hungary, of becoming the victim of German expansion. Hungarian policy cannot risk such a rapprochement with the Little Entente as would excite German anger against her. This was reflected in the speech of the Hungarian Foreign Minister, Mr. Kánya, on 1 June 1938, in which he expressed the loyal friendship of Hungary towards Germany, but also stressed his wish to achieve a normalisation of Hungary's relations with the Little Entente. But he also made some unfriendly remarks about Czechoslovakia: and as Hungary obviously cannot hope to break up the solidarity of the Little Entente by such attacks, it may be assumed that she seeks thereby to ingratiate herself with Germany at the present moment. Nazi propaganda, as is well known, is trying to persuade credulous Hungarian politicians that they could gain a large portion of Slovakia and Carpathian Ruthenia and acquire a common frontier with Poland, if only they would fall in with the aims of German policy. But the more sober-minded Hungarian politicians realise that similar propagandist promises were made to Budapest, when it was hinted that the Burgenland would be returned to Hungary as soon as Austria was annexed by Germany. (Similarly, Yugoslavia was promised the parts of Carinthia annexed to Austria after the plebiscite of 1920, in order to win Yugoslav support for the Anschluss by prospects of territorial gain.) None of these promises was fulfilled, and hence realistic Hungarian politicians do not place much reliance on fresh German promises which could only be fulfilled at the expense of Czechoslovakia.

Even though there are no grounds for sanguine hopes for a rapprochement between Hungary and the Little Entente, there is still no reason to abandon these hopes completely, or indeed any attempt to encourage Hungarian resistance to German pressure. While it is the duty of the Little Entente to strive continuously for the improvement of her relations with Hungary, it would be prudent of Britain and France to strengthen Hungarian resistance by economic and financial support, such as might make her less dependent on agricultural export trade to Germany.

In any case it will greatly depend on the further development of British and French policy whether a strengthening of the Little and the Balkan Ententes can be achieved, and whether a rapproche-



ment between Hungary and Bulgaria and these states will be possible. The same holds true of Poland. In recent years the real or supposed weakness of French and British policy contributed to a reorientation of Polish foreign policy: she loosened her ties in the West and came considerably closer to the Third Reich. Polish policy apparently, ever since 1934, when Austrian Social Democracy, the most active force of resistance against Nazism, was crushed, seems to have reckoned with the Anschluss, and to have been obviously glad to see German expansion turning towards the Danubian basin and away from the Polish frontier. Without venturing any opinion as to how far this policy was short-sighted, we may point out that it was not unanimously applauded in Poland, and that criticism of Colonel Beck's foreign policy has grown not only in the Opposition camp, but also among Government supporters, especially since the Anschluss. Polish politicians who are able to foresee the future realise that the position of Poland would be seriously endangered if Czechoslovakia were to fall within the German orbit. After all, Masaryk's saying, frequently repeated during the Great War, is still true today: "Without a free Poland there cannot be a free Czechoslovakia, but also without a free Czechoslovakia there cannot be a free Poland." Just at the present moment the influence of British and French policy could make itself felt effectively at Warsaw.

Polish policy was not pleased by the conclusion of Czechoslovakia's pact of mutual resistance with Soviet Russia. But it must be pointed out that before the conclusion of the pact Czechoslovakia had offered to Poland a special treaty of friendship with important consequences for the military defence of both countries. Moreover, the pact with Russia was dependent on the Franco-Soviet pact and was signed only when the attempt to conclude a collective Eastern pact, in which Germany, Czechoslovakia, Poland, the Baltic States and Russia were to take part, had failed. Poland did not answer the Czechoslovak proposal, but continued in her unfriendly attitude: and hence Prague would have gravely risked her own security if she had not by a pact of mutual assistance assured herself of the friendship of the most powerful Eastern European state, which is Russia. We do not wish to enumerate all the reasons which justify the policy of friendship pursued by Czechoslovakia towards Russia. Nor need we defend ourselves against the charge of "Bolshevism." Everybody who knows the political and social structure of our state is well aware that there are few countries which are so completely immune against Communism as Czechoslovakia today. The existence of a comparatively numerous

Communist party in Czechoslovakia does not contradict this assertion, for the real political power of this party is in no relation to the number of its adherents. It has no decisive influence either on the internal or the external policy of the country, which is conducted, even as regards relations with Soviet Russia, without any regard to the Czechoslovak Communist party. In contradistinction to M. Laval, Dr. Beneš did not ask Stalin at the time of the signing of the Czechoslovak-Russian pact for any special guarantees as to communist activities in Czechoslovakia, and he reserved himself complete freedom in his attitude to the Czechoslovak Communist party in spite of the friendship with the Soviet state. It must moreover be acknowledged that since the establishment of friendly relations, Moscow policy has not interfered, and is not at present interfering, with the internal affairs of Czechoslovakia. Czechoslovakia is in this point governed by considerations well expressed in 1936 by her Foreign Minister Dr. Krofta, who himself has conservative political opinions. "If we are convinced that our political, social and economic régime is better, more advantageous, healthier and more rational than the Soviet régime, then we cannot be afraid of our régime being completely undermined or overthrown by the Soviet order. If we are not convinced and if the Soviet régime is better than ours, we shall not be able to prevent the influx of these ideas or even to baulk their victory for all time. No doubt, in reality, the two régimes will influence each other and will accommodate themselves to each other, at least to the extent of their international co-operation proving possible without special difficulties, fears or dangers."

The main reason why we hold to our friendship to Russia is the conviction that Russia could render us effective help under the agreement concluded. We think that it is a mistake to underrate the strength of Soviet Russia. According to German and Polish estimates, published recently in several books and periodicals, the Soviet army has today about 120-135 infantry divisions, and of these between 80-90 are in European Russia. Up to June 1917 Russia put 288 infantry divisions in the field. Today she could during the very first month of mobilisation mobilise 240-270 divisions. Recently her system of transport, both by railway and road has been very much improved, especially in the western parts of European Russia. Experts agree that Russia could assemble about 100 infantry divisions within 2 or 3 weeks on her Western frontier. Besides this, in the western districts there are already

about 18 divisions of cavalry. For comparison we may repeat that Germany has about 60-70 divisions, in other words not more than Russia had a year ago in her European districts. France with her colonial empire has at least the same number of divisions as Germany. At a sober estimate it is certain that France and European Russia combined are at least twice as strong as Germany in man-power. The periodical *Deutsche Wehr* recently counted as many as 28 armoured regiments with 10,000 tanks in Soviet Russia. According to Polish sources the Russian air force has some 8,600 fighters and some 2,500 training aircraft. The German air force is estimated at between 6,000 and 6,500 aircraft. But we can judge of the military resources of Russia properly, only if we take into consideration the greatly increased industrialisation which the Soviet Union has carried out in her Five Year Plans, with the express object of increasing her military preparedness. The present-day industry of Russia is efficient enough to supply her army with all sorts of war material in sufficient quantities, and she also has enough raw materials essential for war industry, being in this respect almost self-sufficient. Besides it is important that her main industries, or their branch establishments are situated far from any frontiers and are therefore almost immune from possible attacks by enemy aircraft. Russia can rely confidently on uninterrupted industrial production in war-time. It is also very important that the Russian General Staff has given up the strategy of "inner lines" between Poland and Vladivostok, so that today she has built up two completely independent armies, one for European Russia and one for the Far East. As far as numbers and equipment are concerned no one with any inside knowledge can doubt that the Soviet army is one of the strongest armies in the world. One may, of course, object that the morale of the army does not come up to the high technical standard of the equipment. Usually the great political trials which have taken place during the last two years in Russia are noted as evidence to this effect. Undoubtedly these trials were a sign of an internal political crisis: but even if we take the most unfavourable opinion of their wisdom, the subsequent development has not confirmed the theory that the Soviet state has been seriously shaken by them. On the contrary, there are many signs which point to an internal strengthening of the Stalin régime since the "liquidation" of the main representatives of Bolshevik "dynamism" and the suppression of the Germanophil politicians and soldiers. In any case, there is nothing to prove that the Soviet state has to contend with greater and more dangerous internal difficulties than many other states. So far especially as the army

is concerned, its command is today more unified in policy and more disciplined in military matters than it was before the suppression of the group around Tukhachevsky. Besides, one must bear in mind that the peace-time establishment of the Russian army is two million men so that she could during a war supplement her numbers with much slower mobilisation measures than other states which, owing to their much smaller man power, would be compelled to mobilise the majority of their citizens in the first weeks of the war.

There are no rational grounds for underrating the military power of Soviet Russia. In spite of propaganda which tries to spread distrust and enmity towards the Soviet Union, the Germans themselves have a high opinion of Russian strength. That is just the reason why they try to undermine any cooperation of the West with Russia, and want to isolate either the West or Russia. For the same reason German propaganda and policy is directed against the Czechoslovak-Russian treaty, though it is obvious that an enforcement of this Pact would be subject to a decision of the League of Nations, and that Czechoslovakia would always prevent its use as an instrument of aggression. If Russia were not a powerful force, German policy would scarcely do everything to break up the Russo-Czechoslovak-French alliance.

Even if we understand that British or French policy may take exceptions to Moscow policy, we still consider the cooperation of the West with Russia an indispensable factor in a world-wide peace front. In any case such co-operation is one of the indispensable conditions for the preservation of peace and for the securing of a clear superiority against Pan-German aggression.

From the special Czechoslovak point of view one must also stress the fact that the help which Russia has promised to Czechoslovakia would considerably ease the task of France and indirectly of Great Britain, in upholding the independence of Czechoslovakia. Russian help eases the position of France, as otherwise the whole burden of possible succour for Czechoslovakia would fall only on her shoulders. In co-operation with Russia France can successfully continue her Central European policy, which is a condition of the preservation of her position as a Great Power in Europe, without dispersal or straining of her resources. In proportion as France's task is lightened, Great Britain's policy of cooperation with France becomes easier. This is the more important as Britain is not so directly interested in Central European affairs as France, even if everyone who knows the extent to which European problems are indivisible and intertwined, must realise that a destruction of the

present order in the Danubian and Balkan regions would also touch the most vital interests of Britain.

Lastly, we must say quite openly: Czechoslovakia has been guaranteed Russian help, and it would be a culpable lack of foresight if she were to surrender it without obtaining some equivalent guarantee elsewhere. And as it is not quite certain that in spite of all ideological and political conflicts Germany and Russia may not again some day reach an agreement, Czechoslovakia would not follow a rational line of policy if she did not seek to secure herself against such an eventuality even now, by friendly cooperation with Russia.

We have tried to describe the present international situation of Czechoslovakia and to outline her present importance in European politics, as the key to the Danubian basin and the Balkans. Hence the preservation of her independence is not only an interest of the Czechoslovak nation, but is also in the fullest sense of the word the interest of all Europe. Danger to Czechoslovak independence is necessarily also a danger to the whole political system of Europe and the Near East. Her position was certainly rendered more difficult by the annexation of Austria, but the "Anschluss" does not in itself constitute a menace to the foundations of her independence. President Masaryk and Dr. Beneš even during the war reckoned with a possible union of Germany and Austria, but continued to struggle for Czechoslovak independence, because they were convinced that it could be upheld even if that union were achieved. Today, of course, even more than ever before, it is necessary to strengthen the political and economic conditions for the independence of the smaller Danubian states and to promote the closest possible political and economic co-operation between them. But at the same time it is perfectly possible to respect to the full the legitimate interests of the Greater German Empire, which for reasons of geography will always continue to exercise a considerable influence in this area. There can be no question of depriving Germany of this influence. But we must resist attempts to make this region the victim of Pan-German domination. This is not only the cause of the Danubian nations now directly menaced by the Pan-German expansion, but also the interest of the whole of Europe—and even of the whole world.

We do not ask help from those who cannot or do not want to give it, but we ask them for a correct appreciation of the Czechoslovak problem. If it is understood correctly, it will be easier to draw the right conclusions in political practice.

10 June 1938.

HUBERT RIPKA.

# THE SOKOL MOVEMENT

## ITS CONTRIBUTION TO GYMNASTICS.

WHEN on 16 February, 1862, the first general meeting of a new Czech society for physical training was held at Prague, scarcely any one of those who attended could foresee how important a part this newly founded organisation was destined to play in the cultural and political life of the nation and how far-reaching its influence would be even abroad. The two men, Dr. Miroslav Tyrš and Jindřich Fügner, to whom it was due that the mere frame of a gymnastic association was filled with a new spirit, were men of high intelligence in contrast to the other reformers of gymnastics in the 19th century. They understood clearly what were the demands of the time both on their nation and the world. That is the reason why the development of a gymnastic club in Prague from a society for physical training to a large-scale national and later international organisation, was so rapid: only a few months after its foundation the "Sokol" ("Falcon") began its expansion, which is by no means at an end today.

Tyrš, already in the earliest days of his society, hit with remarkable insight on the two principal questions of national life which he wanted to solve by "Sokol" ideals. He, first of all, understood the importance of physical training for both the physical and moral health of the nation, for all classes, for the young and for adults, for men and for women; and he also conceived of gymnastics as an expression of the artistic instinct of man and treated it as an indispensable factor in the national life, of equal importance with singing, the fine arts and music. It was only a consequence of this peculiar conception of gymnastics that the Sokol movement played later also such an important part in the political struggle against Austria, and even in the fight for the liberation of the nation.

We must, therefore, first of all, study the gymnastic system of Tyrš and try to place it in the general history of gymnastics, in order to ascertain what is new in Tyrš's system, what the general development of gymnastics owes to Tyrš, either directly or indirectly, and also what might still be taken over from him. In the *Foundations of Gymnastics*, a long technical book published in 1867, Tyrš divided all physical exercises into four groups: (1) Exercises without apparatus and without the help or the resistance of other gymnasts: simple drill and drill in groups, (2) exercises with the use of apparatus such as the vaulting-horse or block, horizontal and parallel bars, etc., or, again, with dumb-bells, weights and vaulting poles, etc.; (3) exer-

cises which can be carried out only with the help of others : group exercises ; (4) exercises in which we have to overcome the resistance of another human being either with tools or without, like wrestling, boxing, fencing, etc.

There is nothing very original in this classification. It is more or less identical with the German system as it was analysed by Adolf Spiess, the most important successor of "Turnvater" Jahn. Jahn himself did not care for system, but he introduced several kinds of apparatus (the vaulting-horse and block, the horizontal bar and the climbing-pole), and he increased the variety of exercises. Tyrš's original work begins with a more detailed analysis of the system : he himself stresses this point in the Introduction to his main book on gymnastics : "the order of the different groups of exercises, the whole classification both of simple exercises as well as of exercises with apparatus and finally the whole series of instructions on combinations, as well as most of the suggestions on methods are completely original, and everywhere we have examined the interrelations of system and method."

In Spiess's system, which before Tyrš had already spread to the gymnastic societies of Switzerland, France and Belgium, and which continued to be used long after Tyrš even in Slavonic countries, especially in Russia, exercises were divided according to the kind of muscles used and the way they were exercised. This was a system which had been learned from anatomy. Spiess in distinction to Jahn had, however, introduced simple drill and group exercises. The main defect of the system—even ignoring its theoretical shortcomings—was its uselessness inside a gymnasium filled with groups of gymnasts. It was impossible to proceed on this system, as every type of exercise had to be carried out on a different apparatus, and it was necessary to pass from one apparatus to the other. In Spiess's system German thoroughness was too apparent (e.g. the division of walking on full soles, on heels, on the outside or the inside edges of the soles, etc.). Tyrš, it is true, also divided exercises into those with or without apparatus, and Tyrš also divided exercises according to the kind of apparatus. But in the further subdivisions he considers the nature of the exercise itself, and he has thought out a very ingenious, simple and clear system of exercises, which in the most various ways work all the muscles of the body, but at the same time are carried out in the same or a similar way on all types of apparatus. By a combination of the types of exercises and the method of carrying them out, a great number of variations of exercises is produced, even when suitable for only one type of apparatus.

From the individual combinations we can make up shorter or longer exercises, with two or three men, and either individuals or a whole group can carry out exercises simultaneously on several types of apparatus. By this system a larger number of variants, permutations and combinations can be arrived at, but we never lose a grasp of the whole: we can designate the elements as Tyrš suggested, simply by numbers and combine them easily enough. Just as, for instance, on the horizontal bar the same system can be repeated on the parallel bars, elsewhere, a very similar combination may be used even with other kinds of apparatus, and every trainer has an almost unlimited number of ways of keeping up the interest of the gymnasts. There is at least the appearance of newness every time, so that he can exercise all the muscles of the whole body on one type of apparatus, and can reach the ideal by which genuine physical training differs from athletics: the harmonious development of the whole body. By this variety and continued keeping up of interest Tyrš's system even surpasses the Swedish system of Ling which is prevalent in Scandinavia, and has also from time to time influenced Central Europe.

Tyrš's system could uphold this ideal of all-round physical education also because in the Sokol movement the competitive spirit could not be developed as in German or French gymnastics. In the first years of the movement some outstanding members were attracted by the idea of badges and prizes, such as those of the German "Turners"; but already Tyrš succeeded in suppressing such excesses by stressing rather a high average level of performances than any "record" seeking by champions.

But Tyrš was not content to introduce an almost scientific system into gymnastics. He tried to give them a philosophic basis in the evolutionism of Darwin, which was then at the height of its influence. He tried to illustrate the necessity of systematic physical training by the needs of the "struggle for life," in which especially a small nation which cannot rely on its numbers must excel by quality. Tyrš's system is, however, not only a science and a philosophy: Tyrš himself became a Professor of æsthetics at the University of Prague, and he devoted a great part of his life-work to the history of art. Therefore, in his system of gymnastics physical exercises become also an expression of artistic creativeness as part and parcel of the fine arts. In its highest expressions gymnastics are to approximate music, and accompany it, as the text of a melodrama accompanies the music of the composer.

Tyrš, then, does not only stress the ideal of the beautiful, well-



trained body which was, after all, already spread by classical antiquity. Not only the result of physical training must be beautiful, but the physical exercises themselves, either seen in motion or at stand-still, must satisfy the eye æsthetically; every single exercise, whether simple or with apparatus, must be beautiful. Tyrš excluded combinations which he considered ugly or tasteless, even though they were not excluded from his system for technical reasons.

By his philosophical and æsthetic bent Tyrš far surpassed his predecessors. Those who were philosophers before him, like Comenius, Rousseau or Pestalozzi, thought of physical training only as a help in general education. The others, such as the Frenchman of Spanish descent, Amoroso or the Germans Jahn, Eiselen and Spiess, were simply good gymnasts, or at the most, good teachers of gymnastics or trainers. They did not have any theoretical training, and did not care for it. Especially Jahn was a primitive mind governed by impulse rather than rational reflection. Tyrš also revived classical and Renaissance ideas in gymnastics. The æsthetic side of Tyrš's system could come out best in the simple exercises and only in some exercises with apparatus, because, after all, exercises with apparatus are much more limited to fixed movement, which it is not possible to change very much according to the style. But there is an unlimited number of possible movements of a man standing, walking or running. Moreover, the possibility of improving exercises without apparatus from the æsthetic point of view is multiplied many times by mass exercises: it is possible to use to great effect a large mass of gymnasts, either distributed in symmetric groups on a playing field or on a stage.

Tyrš also introduced the mass exercises which during the last decades have become the climax of the great Sokol Congresses. These have done more even than the individual victories of Sokols in international championships to spread the fame of the movement abroad. They were not altogether Tyrš's invention. In the Swiss, French and German societies also mass exercises at large meetings were common in the sixties and seventies of last century, while Tyrš organised the first real mass exercises only in 1882 at Prague on the occasion of the first General Congress of the Sokol organisation. But it must be mentioned that he had prepared a similar display of simple exercises already in 1868 for a congress, which was to have accompanied the laying of the foundation stone of the National Theatre. And lastly mass exercises were common on the programmes of public displays of Sokol societies from the very beginning.

But though these exercises were not Tyrš's original idea as such, he was the first who made them not only a display of physical fitness and moral discipline, but also a colourful *tableau vivant* in motion, a real work of art. Tyrš, first of all, introduced absolute order and strict discipline to the training-field. At Tyrš's displays there were for the first time special cloakrooms for the gymnasts where they changed into special drill uniforms. In earlier times only red shirts were used, while the trousers were of unbleached linen. Tyrš led his men to the playing-field in closed columns, and there he carried out a complex deployment (these were, I believe, a new feature in the forming of ranks). These evolutions led to the initial position and the actual opening of the ranks. This was not aided by signs on the ground as it is today, but, nevertheless, was extremely precise, since the leaders of local societies fifty or sixty years ago stressed especially exercises in rows and the elements of simple drill. In Germany, Switzerland and England at that time, however, the whole procession, just as it had marched through the town, simply filed on to the training-field carrying their flags, a confused colourful picture of the most varied dresses in all sorts of formations. Only after arrival at the playing-field the flags were laid aside, and the gymnasts lined up only after individual groups had moved irregularly from one side to the other in order to fill empty corners of the field. Then the men doffed their coats, laid them on the ground in front of them, and began to do their drill which usually had not been prepared beforehand, but only imitated the movements of the instructors leading the exercises. There was no order or æsthetic effect in the whole. And even in the 20th century, such lack of order marred the mass displays of gymnastic societies abroad.

This particular initial evolution was characteristic for the early period of the Sokol movement, as it was used even at small displays of local societies in which sometimes not more than ten men took part. When the number of gymnasts at general or regional congresses grew to ten thousand and even more, it was necessary to leave out this evolution and to line up by the shortest direction, as this evolution would have taken up a disproportionately long time. For this reason the impression created by the motion of the masses evolving was replaced by changes of formations during the exercises which were called "transitions from one section to the other," a change which was however only introduced after Tyrš's death.

As in every work of art, so also in the gymnastics of Tyrš and his successors the style of the times makes itself felt. Again most

clearly in the simple exercises. Tyrš's combinations are simple, clear, sharply defined by regular changes of movement and motionless attitudes, by the moving of arms through 90 degrees, by steps forward to the side and backward, and by regular rhythm. All Tyrš's exercises are in common time, and the changes of position are confined to turning towards the four sides of the field. This clearness and regularity characterises the Renaissance style in gymnastics, as the exercises are considered as though they were pictures come to life. If we would look for a parallel in musical history, we might possibly find it in the early stages of classical music. Also in Tyrš's combinations a simple given theme, the gymnastic element, is developed in two bars, is repeated on the other side (with the other foot and hand), and then with turnings in all four directions. Meanwhile the main element does not change, and the whole combination is clear like the simplest movement of a sonata. The whole exercise is, so to say, conducted in one plane, revolving, at an angle not exceeding ninety degrees, on the vertical axis, forward to the side or backward, so that the whole composition makes an effect of order and symmetry.

The combinations used in the Sokol displays today are not confined to the patterns set by Tyrš. Especially the great Congresses inspired the Sokol composers since it was necessary to invent something new, more perfect and more difficult. The movements of hands and legs which were used before, were supplemented by changes of positions, like squatting, kneeling, resting on all fours, so that the dimensions of the compositions are increased. Two beats are no longer sufficient to develop the main theme, which had to be varied. The whole mass of the gymnasts began to move; the original quiet plane disappeared; besides the turns through 90 degrees, also half-angles were used; the whole movement of the composition increased, that is the variety of movements increased, until finally the individual section of the composition lost the character of a complete number and the compositions became linked up by special transitions. The rhythm was no longer counted out as in the time of Tyrš, but was prescribed by the music played. Such an increase in the elements made it possible for the composers to abandon absolute music and to give descriptive titles to their compositions, just like composers of programme music. The struggle for liberty and the fatherland are the most frequent themes symbolised, which are to be expressed by the movements of the exercises. As a parallel in fine arts we may think of the statues by Baroque artists, and their violent motion and emotion, and

possibly also the pseudo-Baroque façades of buildings at the end of the 19th century are composed on similar principles to the contemporary compositions for gymnastic exercises. Instead of common time the whole movement of the gymnastic exercise is now developed like the movement of a sonata or symphony. It has its leading motive, which is elaborated and developed, and describes an arc rising slowly from the beginning and falling after the culminating-point towards the concluding bar.

Even this did not satisfy the composers in recent years. Their artistic interest begins to exceed the earlier ambition of composers for gymnastic exercises. They are no longer interested in how far the body of the gymnasts is exercised, but they think rather of the beautiful picture, they strive rather to achieve surprising effects both on the eye and ear of the spectators. They use all the artistic and musical achievements of recent times for this purpose. And they succeed because they know modern art, and have an excellent material to work upon. Movements and attitudes, of course, lose much of their original clearness; many transitional positions with angles of 30 degrees or even less, which are difficult to describe, are made use of. The whole mass on the field is now frequently shot through by vibrations and wavy movements. In other arts the same methods are used which the modern composer uses when he changes the key rapidly: everything becomes one complex picture, one melody of movement, so that only the trained eye is able to discern the individual section according to the exercises they carry out. But the spectator feels the whole as a single poem, as one musical composition or picture, and he sees its meaning and symbolism. The parallel to the modern development of fine arts towards symbolism or expressionism is obvious, so it need not be pressed too far.

The Sokol composers can indulge in their modernistic taste even more in smaller displays with specially selected gymnasts. We have, therefore, to look for the most modern expressions of the art of the composer at local displays, on small stages. There frequently the old regular rhythm is varied, we hear modern syn-copes, disharmonies, unexpressed and continuous movements just as in a quartertone composition, and sometimes even in grotesque displays some composers make bold attempts at something which might be described as gymnastic jazz. This sophisticated stage is a great contrast to the early period of seventy years ago, when physical training was an end in itself in the Sokol movement or just a means to physical fitness and moral discipline. Whatever

we may think of these last developments it was on the whole a great achievement of the Sokol movement to raise gymnastics to the status of a fine art.

(ii)

Vivid interest in the development of gymnastics abroad was another reason for these rapid changes. Already Tyrš had recommended again and again to his trainers to follow developments abroad and to adapt whatever they considered worthwhile and useful. Tyrš himself had studied carefully everything which had preceded him from antiquity to his own time, and he had taken over from his predecessors everything which he felt able to use. Nothing which was adopted in the Sokol system after the death of Tyrš changed the fundamentals of his system, and there are few human achievements which have stood the test of time so well as Tyrš's. It has of course been supplemented in many details. New apparatus was introduced which increased the variety of the exercises (for instance, clubs, an English invention, ladders from Swedish gymnastics, baton from France), and also the number of combinations was increased by the introduction of new exercises or new adaptations of exercises to the system devised by Tyrš. More attention is paid today to simple drill; on the summer playing-fields games are played which were unknown to Tyrš, but the greatest changes took place in gymnastics for children, juveniles and women.

Already Tyrš knew that physical training must not be limited to men, and that the whole nation must be won for the movement. Every Czech, whether man or woman, should become a Sokol. Tyrš at least prepared the way for juvenile and women groups. He founded a special society for women and girls in Prague. But the time was not ripe for woman to be the equal of man in gymnastics; several decades had to elapse, and the influence of the general emancipation of women had to exert its influence before women could become prominent in the movement. Though Tyrš did not write anything fundamental on women's gymnastics, he prepared several good women trainers in his Prague society, and these were able to build on the foundations which he had laid. They kept unchanged the main outlines of his system, and adapted them to the special requirements of women's gymnastics. The same more or less happened also in gymnastics for juniors. Tyrš trained a great many collaborators and successors who frequently were themselves teachers in primary and secondary schools, and had, therefore, the best opportunities for trying out everything they had learned.

Besides, the adaptation of Tyrš's system to the needs of women and children was not a particularly difficult problem, as his system is elastic enough to allow its further application without change of fundamentals

At the end of the 19th century women's sections were being founded, but these again were abolished after 1900, when women were granted the same rights of membership as men. Regular hours for children led by Sokol trainers, were also introduced about the same time. In these new sections new trends were more readily accepted than in the original branches where traditions were firmly established. Luckily the leaders of the women's and children's gymnastics never forgot the wise warning of the founder, that we have to examine carefully everything new before we adopt it, and so only sensible innovations were made.

In the last decade of the 19th century the Sokols both in Bohemia and America learned most from France. The gymnastic system of Demeny was enthusiastically received, and just before the war rhythmic gymnastics made their victorious entry into women's gymnastics. Apart from the direct influence of the French, the Dalcroze school at Hellerau near Dresden was the most influential. Visits of American Czechs, who at that time were leading in women's gymnastics, popularised these new methods in the homeland. But all these developments only served to confirm the principle laid down by Tyrš, that women's and children's gymnastics must not be a simple repetition of gymnastics for men, that all great muscular exertion must be eliminated, and that stress should be laid rather on elasticity and grace of movement. We must, according to Tyrš, use the æsthetic criterion even more in women's gymnastics than in men's, and woman must not in the gymnasium offend the sense of beauty by even a single movement.

Even more than this daily work in the gymnasium the mass appearance of women at the Sokol congresses helped to dispel prejudice against women's gymnastics. At the 1907 Congress women did their exercises during a violent thunderstorm and down-pour of rain, and they retired from the field in perfect order; in 1912 they for the first time filled the whole of the stadium, just as the men, with simple drills. For many of the foreigners present the sight of the display by men was, after all, only a more perfect performance of things they could have seen at home, but the mass appearance of women was an absolute novelty at the time, and made an enormous impression. On the whole one can say that women helped to advance the Sokol cause in the world much more than

one would judge from their numbers and the time of their work in the movement.

(iii)

Analysing for the moment only the gymnastic activities of the Sokol without regard to its doctrines and ideals, we have hitherto ascertained what was original in the Sokol movement in comparison with the general development of gymnastics. We must, now consider how far this original contribution was adopted by other nations, and by whom. Unfortunately it is difficult to ascertain this foreign debt to the Sokol movement with entire precision. The Sokols themselves (like all other gymnasts) were not very particular about authors' rights and used foreign work without acknowledging the source, and so it is sometimes very difficult indeed to define clearly what is an original and what a copy.

Moreover, books on the history of gymnastics discuss usually much more carefully the background of ideas than the actual technical achievement in gymnastics. Though we are conscious of entering on very uncertain ground, we shall try to trace the influence of the Sokol in other countries.

Knowing how little Czech work was noticed abroad (and seventy years ago the situation was much worse in this respect than today) we can understand why the Sokols were founded without attracting any outside notice, and why nobody seems to have even noticed Tyrš's great work on the *Foundation of Gymnastics*. This was true not only of the Germans, French and Italians. The Slovenes, who were nearest to the Czechs in Austria in their political position, and who, therefore, paid the closest attention to Czech work, founded, it is true, a Sokol society as early as 1863, but the exercises there were carried out in the German Turner style imported from Vienna, and only later a German trainer was replaced by an Italian teacher of fencing. The first gymnastic societies of the Croats and the Poles knew nothing about the Sokols. In 1871 the Russian Government called in Germans as teachers of gymnastics, and in 1887 the Serbian Government sent a study group abroad, to advise on the introduction of gymnastics into schools; but the commission was asked to study only the German and the Swedish system, so that a decision could be made which of these two systems should be introduced into Serbian schools. The first gymnastic textbooks in the other Slavonic languages also ignore the Sokol movement. A knowledge of the early stages of the Sokol movement naturally spread even less in the non-Slavonic countries.

In the period following the renewal of constitutional life in

Austria, especially in the seventies and eighties, relations between the Slavonic nations of the Austrian Empire became slowly closer. The most intimate relations were established with the Yugoslavs, especially the Slovenes, and these intensified when a common political struggle began in the Austrian Reichsrat, and when after the partition of the Prague University into a Czech and a German one, Yugoslavs began to attend the former in growing numbers. This explains why relations between the Yugoslav gymnastic societies and the Sokols became more frequent. At last the Ljubljana (Laibach) Society asked in 1870 for a trainer from the central corps of the Prague Sokol. The Czech leader did not stay long at Ljubljana, but his stay was long enough to introduce the Sokol method in place of the Turner system hitherto used, and to adapt Tyrš's terminology to the Slovene language. The Polish society at Lwów (Lemberg) followed suit soon afterwards, and in 1876 the Croat society at Zagreb called in a Czech instructor. These trainers introduced Tyrš's system everywhere, and also trained local instructors, so that even after their return home the Sokol tradition continued to exert its influence.

At last the Czech gymnastic system penetrated also to Russia. Since 1889, when the editors of the Prague periodical "Sokol" made contacts with the Russian gymnastic societies (before that date a Czech had a private gymnastic institute at Odessa in 1886), up to the world war a large number of Sokol trainers were in Russia, teaching at Russian schools, and these, of course, immediately founded Sokol societies wherever they went. Sokol influence was even indirectly felt in military training. But for a long time the Russian Government did not trust the Sokol societies, and Russian gymnastics wavered between the German and the Czech system. Only since 1907 was Tyrš's system extensively adopted.

Former trainers of the Prague Sokol introduced also Tyrš's system into the Czech gymnastic societies in America, which were being founded since 1865, but later they again wavered between unorganised gymnastic activities and work of a philanthropic nature. There was for a time even a danger that the Sokol societies would become charitable burial societies. It was due to the energy of a few former members of the Czech Sokol that at last a decision was reached to call in a trainer from Prague. He actually started work in 1886, and in a few years' time the American Sokol societies not only made up for lost time, but their gymnasts themselves began to be active in adapting suggestions derived from the gymnastics of the different nationalities in the United States. Through



their influence several important new features, such as Swedish clubs and women's rhythmic were introduced into the gymnastic system of the old country.

Thus even before the war Tyrš's system was gaining ground everywhere in the Slavonic world, and in 1908 a Union of the Slavonic Sokols was established which confirmed the prevalence of the Sokol system. The uniformity of the system in the Slav Sokol movement was guaranteed also by the fact that the Slav nations arranged exercises and displays in common, and, of course, the preparation of champions had to be uniform as well as the principles of drill.

Of all the non-Slavonic nations Germany was always the most remote, even though it is the geographical neighbour of the Czechs. But one cannot say that there was no mutual knowledge. Almost all Turner congresses and festivals were attended by Sokol reporters, and leading German Turners were frequent guests at Sokol displays, or even occasionally joined the exercises of the Prague Sokol as official guests. There cannot be any doubt that such visits were useful for experienced trainers on both sides. But anything made use of remained anonymous, since neither side was eager to boast about what it took over from the other. Preference was always given to other nations when it was possible to learn anything from them. So in spite of the geographical neighbourhood relations were, on the whole, slight and so were mutual influences. The Sokol, if we disregard the things which Tyrš had learned from Jahn, adopted only a few details from the Germans in gymnastics with apparatus, while the Germans again were certainly influenced in their public displays by the grandiose organisation of the Sokol congresses, and by the general discipline and strict order in the Sokol gymnasia. Also the interest in the æsthetic side of the training must have had some influence, though only J. C. Lion began to pay attention to this side in the German movement after 1870.

The Czech Sokols began to cultivate relations with the French gymnasts already long before the war. As early as 1868 the organiser of school gymnastics in France, Eugène Paz, visited the Prague Sokol, but continuous contacts were established only in 1888, when a letter written by the editors of the "Sokol" was sent to the French Union. The letter caused considerable embarrassment, as at first the French did not know where to place these curious "Austrians." The Union of the French gymnasts had been founded after the Franco-German war, and the main motive of its activities was to cultivate the spirit of revenge for 1871. That is also the reason why the French Union came early to an understanding

with the Czech Sokol movement, which at that time was especially preoccupied with politics against Austria and the German domination. The two organisations were also similar in social make-up and in working methods, for in both the middle classes were dominant, though among the Czechs the educated intelligentsia was more numerous than in the French Union. But both societies loved to give stormy expression to their patriotism in solemn declarations. From 1889 onwards, when the Czech Sokols attended the congress of gymnasts at the Universal Exhibition in Paris, mutual visits between France and Bohemia became very frequent, and though at the beginning politicians looked down on these largely superficial contacts, one cannot deny their political importance, and they have certainly promoted Franco-Czech collaboration during the Great War and the intimate friendship and alliance since.

The relations with France were not only social : a lively exchange of gymnastic experiences took place, which was all the easier as the French never adopted the Swedish system and in older times, as far as one can speak of a system at all, were rather nearer to the Swiss, who had a system similar to the German. It was much easier to make the transition from this system to the Sokol method, and again the Sokol trainers could learn more easily from the French. For instance, the musical accompaniment to simple exercises was originally a Swiss invention. We owe to the French model especially since the beginning of the 20th century, several rhythmical exercises. The increased stress on simultaneous exercises which were known to Tyrš, but which the French used to great effect for exercises in small groups, is also due to them. Everything which we took over from France, concerned the exercises of individuals and of groups of a few members only as these exercises were most developed there. Also Demeny's and Dalcroze's systems are meant only for small numbers. The Czech teachers took whatever they found useful, but always adapted it carefully to the special character of Tyrš's system.

Czech composers also adopted Demeny's and Dalcroze's gymnastics in their own way, as one can see still today in mass exercises. They introduced new rhythms not only into the simple drill of women but also of men, and thus achieved surprising effects in mass exercises. The unique feeling for discipline and for team work in the whole nation was a precondition of success. But as in rhythmic elements of women gymnastics are mainly used, women mass gymnastics began to develop suddenly, and triumphed for the first time at the Congress of 1907.

The successes of women at the Congresses of 1907, 1912, and especially 1926 and 1932 made a deep impression on the foreign guests, and especially the French. They expressed their sincere regret that it was not possible to introduce the Czech women's gymnastics in France, since the Frenchwoman could not fulfil the difficult demands asked for in the Sokol exercises. The Frenchwoman, we were told, would rather indulge in rough games, like Rugby football, but she does not want to be submerged in a mass. The union of women gymnasts in France formulated the aim of their movement expressly as an emulation of their Czech sisters. Hitherto they have not succeeded completely, though just among the teachers of women gymnastics the Frenchman Georges Demeny, who introduced ideas of rhythmic fluency, and later Georges Herbert, were most prominent. On the whole foreigners carried away from the congresses the memory of a "gigantic mystical human machine," as they called it; but outside of France nobody seriously attempted to introduce the methods of Czech women gymnastics abroad. From the Sokol movement the whole organised gymnastics of the world took over only the group exercises on apparatus.

At first sight it is a far cry from the Sokol training field to the English playing-ground, from the mass training of the Sokols to the individualistic team games. The direct influence of English gymnastics can be felt only in the stress on simple drill, on light athletics and games in the Sokol schedule, to which much more time is devoted today than during Tyrš's life. But this is only a change in quantity. England herself could also learn but little, for gymnastic societies were never very important there, and had never pursued national aims. There were only gymnastic societies founded by Germans and using German methods, and in the English societies training was without system or order. But Sokol gymnastics attracted considerable attention in English circles mainly through the interest of Eugene Sully, secretary of the National Physical Recreation Society. Sully propagated the idea that sports should not replace physical training, but should only be its practical application, and he asked that physical training should learn from Prague how the education of a whole nation can be organised. Sully also founded competitions for a silver shield, which were won by the Sokols, and he was also the intermediary between the Sokol leaders and the founder of the Scout movement, Lord Baden Powell. Whatever reminds us of the Sokols in the Boy Scout movement was solely due to Sully. It was different in the United States, where in the eighties English-speaking gym-

nastic societies were founded on the model of the Czech Sokol societies of America.

Through the French relations were also established with the Belgians, and since the war mutual visits have been exchanged with gymnastic societies in the Baltic States, which took some ideas on organisation from the Sokol, though in their methods they are largely under Swedish influence. Comparatively weak were relations with Switzerland, though in spirit the Czech and Swiss societies are very near each other, especially when since the war the Czech Sokol had become an enthusiastic supporter of the new democratic state. Nor are there any close contacts with Italy. In recent years the training school of the Czech Sokol society has aroused most interest abroad, and is frequently visited by guests from all over the world. Here, too, the Roumanians came to learn of Sokol activities.

(iv)

It is only too obvious that Sokol gymnastics did not have the influence abroad which they deserve; but this fact seems to be contradicted by the general respect in which the Sokol movement is held. The congresses, where the representatives of the gymnastics and all nations and states met, carried its fame far and wide, and the Sokols have also shown that in spite of their stress on the average achievement and on gymnastics as a mass movement, they are very well able to compete in international gymnastic championships where only the outstanding record of the individual is considered. Also the other Czech gymnastic organisations founded by the Socialist and Clerical parties served as an indirect propaganda for the Sokol idea, as they took over Tyrš's system without any change. Especially the Workers' Gymnastic Societies proved that Tyrš's system is in itself a guarantee of a higher level of gymnastic achievement than any other system, and the Workers' Societies actually gained through it their ascendancy in the whole international workers' gymnastic movement. But, of course, foreign observers have themselves frequently explained why they cannot simply take over everything in the Sokol movement, however admirable they find it. It is difficult to rely on members of another nation to such an extent, as the demands on discipline and perseverance which are required to carry out the Sokol idea, sometimes seem excessive. At least in mass displays the Sokol model has never been imitated successfully.

The highest achievements of the Sokols are possible only through the peculiar moral atmosphere which Tyrš created in the Sokol

gymnasia. Even before his day people realised, it is true, that gymnastics discipline a young man by the mere fact that they are carried out in teams according to strict schedule. They limit the freedom of the gymnasts in favour of physical training, but neither Jahn nor the French carried discipline to extremes, and they never managed to endow their leaders with the authority voluntarily acknowledged and merrily accepted, which is accorded to the Sokol leader. The Sokol movement established, through a generation of trainers and leaders who were Tyrš's pupils, a tradition of discipline which could demand the most extreme exertions. A Sokol congress has to be prepared by a whole year's intensive work of all local societies, and the central committees must begin work at least two years before the actual congress.

But the discipline of the Sokols is not the only moral value of the movement. Tyrš by gymnastics and discipline wanted to regenerate the whole nation, and the Sokol has actually become a most important national institution. Sometimes even, though scarcely with justification, greater stress has been laid on the general national activity of the Sokol than on its gymnastic side, though only in the latter does the movement display any originality. As it is obvious in general how important gymnastics and physical training are for the national life, only a few words need be devoted to this ideological side of the movement.

The Sokol was not the only national institution which seventy years ago tried to complete the work of the earlier National Revival. Seventy years ago, when in Austria political life was beginning to awake, it was necessary to concentrate upon this aim, so that a nation not yet completely conscious of its nationality should be able to compete in the political struggle. Therefore not only gymnastic societies, but also fire brigades, singing clubs, literary societies, and purely social clubs in town and country used all means of increasing the national consciousness, which was, after all, a precondition for any political successes. Hence the national activity of the Sokols is not an isolated movement of the period, but the originality of their methods shows itself even here. They never forgot the close relation between gymnastics and national propaganda, and therefore, in early times, Sokol excursions which then were actual exercises in marching, combined with the singing of marching songs, proved extremely popular. The Czech song in the streets and in the open air was to rouse the sleeping national consciousness in the most literal sense. As long as Tyrš and his pupils exercised their influence, the public displays of the Sokols

never sank to the level of mere festivals lacking in educational value. For example, it was only necessary to renew the restriction which Tyrš had himself set on the wearing of the Sokol uniform, in order to stop the indiscriminate use which was spreading in the seventies.

This national activity of the Sokol is much too dependent on the special conditions of the Czechoslovak nation to be applicable abroad without considerable changes. Already Jahn at the beginning of the last century had understood the national importance of gymnastics. The German Turner movement had arisen just after the Prussian collapse of 1807, and it was originally inspired by hatred of Napoleon and everything French. The political movement of 1848 had no influence on the rise of gymnastic societies, as it lasted for too short a time. But the slow development of the European states towards political democracy in the second half of the 19th century helped the spread of gymnastic societies considerably. The Italian gymnastic societies arose with the ideal of promoting the moral union of the Italian nation, when it had already achieved political unity, and in France it was realised that in 1871 superior Prussian national discipline had won, and an attempt was made to make this good quickly by founding a gymnastic union. In Switzerland also the gymnasts guarded the old national traditions. In all this there were resemblances to Sokol activities, but, of course, these grew out of the special conditions of the Czechs under Austria.

The ideological side of the Sokol movement could, therefore, be most influential where there were similar political and social conditions, among the subject Slav nations, and especially among the Yugoslavs whose fate was most similar to that of the Czechs. Hence even after the Great War there remained out of the ruins of the once proud Slavonic Sokol Association only the close collaboration of the Czechslovak and Yugoslav Sokols. There are still some relations with the Polish Sokol movement, and Russia is at least represented by its emigration in the Slavonic Association. The Sokol of the Lusatian Sorbs, which was a close imitation of the Czech organisation, did not survive under the new German régime.

We must not forget that already Tyrš did his utmost to make the national idea in the Sokol movement something more than a mere slogan. He wanted people to understand the Czech question as part of the past, present and future of humanity: there was no shallow nationalism in him. The Sokol was to serve the Czech National Revival in a spirit of truth, in the true tradition of the Hussites, in that positive patriotism which works for the increase

of the powers of one's own nation, but avoids anything like blind Chauvinism. Just in this point the Sokol movement contrasted favourably with most other gymnastic movements, especially the German Turners. Later, the Sokol movement was also influenced by Masaryk's ideals of humanity, and it listened to his call for a more perfect realisation of the democratic political ideal. Today these are ideals which cannot be exported, since the majority of European states have closed their frontiers to them. But the whole development of the Sokols created an organisation of great value for political work. This organisation was always clearly directed against the old Austrian Government, and today it consistently works against such political extremism as would like to subvert democracy. The suspicion of the Austrian authorities against the Sokol societies was actually well-founded, as appeared during the Great War, when both the underground struggle at home against Austria and the revolutionary movement abroad were inspired by the Sokol spirit and led by a Sokol sense for discipline and order. The Sokol movement did its best according to its power and opportunities to bring about the independence of Czechoslovakia.

All that we have said shows that the unique contribution of the Sokol movement to mankind (which was also accepted by it partially) lies in the sphere of gymnastics. Gymnastics as conceived by the Sokols are of a higher order: they are a factor in our outlook on life, an artistic and moral expression of the human soul, a joyous cry of mass enthusiasm. The Sokol movement created something entirely new out of materials which were merely the raw mass of the older gymnastics serving purely physical ends. Much of the riches of Sokol ideas which would lead the European community back to the path of true humanitarian democracy, has lain unused hitherto. If this could acquire due influence the Sokol movement would contribute even more to the development of a better Europe than by its gymnastic efforts, however beautiful. It was one of Tyrš's slogans: "Every Czech a Sokol." A new Sokol movement might supplement this slogan by saying in the spirit of Masaryk's humanitarianism: "Every man a Sokol."

FRIDOLÍN MACHÁČEK.

## “THE ELDERS OF SION”

### A PROVED FORGERY

“To what extent the whole existence of this people [the Jews] rests on a continual lie, is shown in an incomparable manner by the ‘Protocols of the Elders of Sion’ which the Jews hate so terribly. These rest on a forgery, so the *Frankfurter Zeitung* groans out into the world—the best proof that they are genuine. What many Jews unconsciously would like to do, is here consciously laid down. It does not matter what Jewish head these revelations come from, the essential point is that with terrifying sureness of aim they lay bare the being and the activity of the Jewish people and reveal them in their inner connections and their final conclusions. The best criticism of them is reality. Whoever studies the historical development of the last hundred years from the standpoint of this book, will at once understand the screaming of the Jewish press. For when once this book has become the common property of a people the Jewish danger may already be regarded as broken.”—ADOLF HITLER, *Mein Kampf*, p. 337.

“In my father’s house I do not remember ever once hearing the word ‘Jew’ during the life of my father.”—*Ibid.*, p. 54.

[It has long been notorious that the Führer is obsessed by a belief in the Jewish peril, and his anti-semitism is fanned by the fanatical Julius Streicher, Editor of *Der Stürmer*, with whom he is on terms of close friendship. Among the many unreproducible calumnies against the Jewish race in which this paper deals, and side by side with the myth of Ritual Murder, the legend of a Jewish conspiracy for World-Dominion has always figured prominently; and the chief “evidence” put forward consists of the so-called “Protocols of the Elders of Sion.”

On this subject no man living can speak with greater authority than Vladimir Burtsev, author of a recent book in Russian entitled *Protokoly Sionskikh Mudretsoy*, Mr. Burtsev has an altogether unique knowledge of the police underworld of Russia in which this impudent forgery was concocted, and his name will always be associated with the exposure of police corruption and intrigue under the Tsarist régime.—ED.]

In the last few years, thanks to Herr Hitler, the whole world has had very much to say about an empty little book which does not deserve any attention whatever. I allude to the so-called “Protocols of the Elders of Sion”. This small pamphlet was composed by plagiarists forty years ago in Paris. They were members of the Russian secret police and strong anti-semites, and their object was to work upon the higher court circles in Petersburg to bring about fresh persecutions of the Jews such as those in which



Hitler is engaged now; but in spite of all their efforts the "Protocols" did not at first obtain any wide circulation even in Russia, although they were several times published there and aroused the interest of very influential anti-semitic groups. But later somehow or other they began to be vigorously circulated in Russia—during the War, and especially after the Russian revolution of 1917; and from the 1930's, thanks to Hitler, they have spread through the whole world.

After the Revolution of March 1917 the Bolsheviks widely developed their activity in Russia, and in October of that year they seized the power. At that time they excited the greatest indignation among various classes of the Russian people; and as there were among their leaders many Jews (besides, it is true, non-Jews such as Lenin and Lunacharsky) it was not difficult for the anti-semites in their general presentation of the facts to mix up the Bolsheviks with tendencies which were exclusively Jewish. The words "Bolsheviks" and "Jews", (who were contemptuously called *Zhidy*) became synonymous.

Thus in Russia from the end of 1917 the fight with the Jews was popular in the population, precisely because it was confused by most people with the fight against the Bolsheviks.

It is during that time that the "Protocols" began to obtain much more energetic circulation in Russia. In 1918, under the influence of Bolshevik persecution, many influential Russian anti-semites passed across the frontier, and there became the first propagandists of the "Protocols". Thanks to them, from 1918 there began to appear in all countries translations of the "Protocols" into various languages. They came out in tens of thousands of copies: first in Germany, then England, America, France, and so on. But their special circulation in mass begins of course later in the 1930's, with the advent of Hitler to power in Germany.

The story of the fabrication of the "Protocols" and their circulation through the whole world is an unusual phenomenon in the history of forged documents in the literature of any country. There have, of course, been many forged compositions which have played a considerable part in the life of different countries. But not one has had so resounding or so shameful a success as has fallen to the lot of the Russian forgery. We have every reason to apply to the "Protocols," more than to any publication of the kind, the Italian proverb: "Books sometimes have their own history."

At the end of the 1890's there lived in Paris a well-known chief of the secret Russian foreign police, Peter Ivanovich Rachkovsky.

His principal task was to fight the Russian emigrants abroad. He was an experienced and successful detective. He made himself famous by the watch which he kept over them and by his provocative activities. But his speciality, among other leaders of the Police Department, was that he was a great master of the composition of forgeries and libels. Using the names of the best known Russian political emigrants, he drew up pamphlets, setting one group of them against another. He intruded into their private life, slandered them and made every kind of stupid accusation. This campaign he conducted very successfully; he himself was very contented with his work, and his chiefs were contented with him.

The espionage activity of Rachkovsky abroad lasted from 1894 to 1902, when he fell into disgrace and was dismissed<sup>1</sup>. It is true that in 1905 he again became necessary to the Russian Government, and was made head of the Police Department in Petersburg.

That is how at the end of the 90's, himself an anti-semite, he wanted to make himself useful to the Russian anti-semites and determined to fabricate, as coming from the Jews, a document which would compromise them and help to excite persecution against them by the Russian Government. The demand for such literature he received from Petersburg; for at that time the Police Department was under the direction of a certain well-known anti-semite, the Assistant Minister of the Interior, General Orzhevsky. Later G. B. Sliozberg discovered and published this memorandum, which was drawn up as early as 1895. It may be regarded as the first instruction to agents of the Police Department as to what was wanted at that time in Petersburg—to fight the Jews.

The mission of making up something to compromise the Jews imposed on him from Petersburg, Rachkovsky executed with success. This was the "Protocols," which became so famous later. No doubt he did not make them by himself, nor did any of his agents. They were the result of the collective work of several anti-semites, Russian and foreign. For their forgery they utilised the extensive literature of that time, not only in French, in which the well-known French anti-semite, Drumont, was then so notorious for his activity. One thing is certain, that Rachkovsky was personally the organiser of this forgery and that he was acting not on his own initiative, but on the instruction and demand of the Police Department in Petersburg. This forgery was made without the

<sup>1</sup> He had shown up a wrong man in the charlatan Philippe Nizier Vachod, who traded on the credulity of the Empress Alexandra.—Ed.

cognisance of the Russian Government as such, but only on the initiative of some of its agents and, further, it was made in secret.

No doubt Rachkovsky did not prepare this forgery for publication for a wide public. He was only thinking of how to bring it to the knowledge of the Emperor Nicholas II and the anti-semites surrounding him. In any case it was not Rachkovsky himself who printed these "Protocols" in Russian; and he could hardly have been otherwise than surprised when he saw that after his forgery had had a measure of attraction for the Tsar and some members of the court circle, he was faced with a completely antagonistic attitude to himself, both on the part of the Tsar and of all his chief Ministers. Rachkovsky even went so far as to disavow this child of his.

The history of the "Protocols of the Elders of Sion" is as follows: Rachkovsky in Paris addressed himself to a fairly capable writer, or rather compiler, Golovinsky, who was one of his agents. It was this Golovinsky who gave him most help in drawing up the "Protocols" and in finding other collaborators. The idea of giving the forgery the form of protocols was suggested to these fabricators by an event which attracted the attention of all anti-semites, the first Jewish Congress, which had just taken place in Basel in 1897. At the sittings of this Congress protocols were drawn up. The Congress, it is true, was exclusively engaged with Jewish affairs. It discussed the settlement of Jews in Palestine and the creation there of a national home for Jews, and it was hoped in time to create in Palestine their own centre of culture. Of course, there was no talk at this Congress of any seizure of world power by the Jews, and there was nothing at all of the charges which are always made against the Jews by anti-semites. But Rachkovsky and his colleagues took no account of what actually happened at the Congress at Basel. They had to attribute to the Jews what anti-semites were generally saying against them, if they were to bring about persecutions of the Jews.

For the literary form of these "Protocols" Golovinsky utilised the brilliant pamphlet of the French lawyer Joly, published in Switzerland in 1864 against Napoleon III. In this pamphlet its author branded Napoleon, without naming him, for his seizure of power in Paris in 1851, for his persecution of liberal opinions, for his censorship, and so on. This pamphlet had nothing whatever to do with the Jewish question.

Joly's book was drawn up in the form of a dialogue in hell between Montesquieu and Macchiavelli. Golovinsky made a not

very clever job of it. Where Napoleon was alluded to, he inserted the word “Jew.” Napoleon cynically recounts how he has strangled the free press and given it the directions which he wanted. He speaks of the bribes by which he controls his opponents. All this Golovinsky attributes to the Jews, and in this form he draws up a veritable act of accusation against them. In this picture of Jewish guilt he inserts all those usual accusations which the anti-semites of all the world brought against them, including Frenchmen of the type of Drumont. A Russian scholar, Yury Delevsky, who published the first book against the “Protocols” in Russia in 1923 (which I cite in my own book on the subject), has indicated a whole mass of quotations which Golovinsky took from the anti-semitic literature of the time.

Golovinsky drew up his pamphlet in the form of secret protocols of twenty-three presumed sittings of the secret “Elders of Sion.” Of course his “Protocols” had nothing in common with those of the Congress of Basel in 1897 and were his own personal production. But they were let loose upon the world, not as the work of anti-semites, but as the intimate confession of Jewish conspirators, the “Elders of Sion.”

The manner of production of the libel of Rachkovsky and Golovinsky is not fully explained. Its authors did everything to conceal the traces of their forgery and none of them ever said a word as to how they compiled it. They understood what a criminal thing they were doing and tried to keep silence as to where, under what circumstances, and for what purpose they had forged this slander. At the present time we can only partially discover the secret of their fabrication.

The forgery was prepared in Paris in 1899 or 1900. They did not hasten to print it, and did not even intend to. They only made efforts to supply it to court circles, where it might come into the hands of Nicholas II. This was successfully achieved; but the “Protocols” were printed for the first time only in 1903 in the Petersburg paper of the well-known anti-semite Krushevan, one of the organisers of the Jewish pogrom of that year.<sup>2</sup> They appeared in a series of articles, but did not attract any special attention in the public. In 1905 they were printed in full as the preface to a book of a strange mystic, S. Nilus. One copy of this book was conveyed to the Emperor Nicholas II. He accepted it with the

<sup>2</sup> With police assistance, Krushevan secured election to the Second Russian Duma.—Ed.

fullest confidence This is evident from the notes made on it by him, which I have published in my book <sup>3</sup>

"What profundity of thought! What foresight! . . . What an exact execution of their programme! . . . Our 1905 was literally under the direction of the Elders! . . . There can be no doubt as to their authenticity! . . . Everywhere is evident the direction of the destructive hand of Jewry," and so on.

Apparently the anti-semites had triumphed; the Tsar's approval guaranteed them the widest success for their publication. But soon a more enlightened member of the Government set himself to open Nicholas's eyes to this forgery, and after that he was sharply hostile to the "Protocols." He not only did not encourage their circulation, but registered this decision.—"The 'Protocols' must be withdrawn. One can't defend a clean cause with dirty weapons." Thus, soon after the "Protocols" had been printed, it became known that the Government and Nicholas II personally regarded them as a forgery. In those years this was enough to settle their fate. Under Nicholas II the "Protocols" found no road in Russia. It is true there was one more edition of them in 1907 by the extreme reactionary, Butmi, and another in 1911, but both of these made no noise and passed unnoticed. Anti-semites spoke of the "Protocols" among themselves, but did not succeed in giving them any wide circulation. More than once they applied to the Government to assist a further edition of the "Protocols," but met with refusal.

After the revolutionary movement of 1905, when political conditions in Russia underwent a sharp change, I returned thither towards the end of 1905, after fifteen years as an emigrant. My arrival almost coincided with the first edition of the "Protocols" in Petersburg, and I heard of them soon after they were published. At this time I was one of the editors of a widely circulated historical monthly, *The Past* (Byloe). Our periodical, in spite of the censorship conditions of the time, precisely because it was a historical magazine, could treat historically subjects touching on the most burning questions of current life. We published a good deal on the Jewish question, and on the Jewish pogroms which had taken place at that time, and thus conducted a definite propaganda directed against the anti-semites. In view of this, one of our collaborators proposed to us to write a very sharp notice on the "Protocols," as an undoubted forgery; but our editors refused outright to accept a

<sup>3</sup> Nilus and his book are mentioned in the correspondence of the Empress—Ed.

review of them, as they thought it inadmissible in a serious political and historical organ to take notice of obviously trivial publications. We did not want to write on the “Protocols” even in order to make another attack on the Government of that time, with which we were fighting over the Jewish question. We knew that even government circles were quite opposed to this publication and regarded it as an evident forgery.

At that time there often came to our office the Director of the Police Department, Lopukhin, who was soon to be sent to Siberia with deprivation of civil rights.<sup>4</sup> At that time he was in opposition and gave us very valuable materials—among other things, on the Jewish question. In conversation with Lopukhin I saw he, like ourselves, regarded the “Protocols of Sion” as a forgery undeserving of any attention. As recent Director of the Police Department—he was at the head of it from 1902 to the beginning of 1905—he was bound to know the truth about the origin of the “Protocols” and their official sources.

A little later, when I was again abroad as an emigrant, I was once again, in 1913-14, interested in the “Protocols”, when I realised that they might be utilised in the famous trial of Beilis in Kiev. There a poor Jew, Beilis, was tried on an obviously senseless charge of killing a Russian boy for ritual purposes to obtain his blood to make unleavened bread. The Russian anti-semites of the time hoped in that trial to deal a tremendous blow to all Jewry. They made long preparations for the trial; the law court, the Prosecutor, the Minister and Justice were all on their side. The civil plaintiffs who supported the charge against Beilis were the fiercest and ablest anti-semites, such as the lawyer, Shmakov, and a member of the Duma, Zamyslovsky; the prosecutor, Vipper, was also a violent anti-semite. One would have thought that this was just the sort of trial where the anti-semites would attack the Jews with the charge that the “Protocols of the Elders of Sion” were their symbol of faith. Of course, if the Government and, most of all, the Tsar had at that time believed in the genuineness of the “Protocols,” the whole of the Kiev trial would have been built in the main on proofs that the “Protocols” were genuine. The Russian Liberal Opposition also prepared for an energetic defence of Beilis. To everyone—including those of us living abroad—it was clear that in this trial the anti-semites were putting forward anything whatever that they could find against the Jews. At that time it seemed to me

<sup>4</sup> Precisely for his disclosures to Burtsev.—ED.

too, that they would use the trial to attack the Jews, relying on the "Protocols."

The trial took place. Both sides, defence and prosecution displayed unusual energy. It was a passionate struggle. In the end Beilis was acquitted; but what is most characteristic is that in the trial neither the anti-semitic prosecutor, Vipper, nor the outstanding anti-semites who were civil prosecutors in the trial—neither Shmakov nor Zamyslovsky—even tried to accuse the Jews as authors of the "Elders of Sion."

Later, at the beginning of 1918 under the Bolsheviks, I happened to be in prison in the same cell with the former director of the Police Department and Assistant Minister of the Interior, Beletsky. It was he above all who, in his official position, had constructed the Beilis trial and done all he could to help the anti-semites to bring home their charges against the Jews. Profiting by the leisure of prison, I had the most intimate talks with Beletsky—among other things, on the Jewish question. We talked of the "Protocols." Beletsky, in the most categorical way, denied their authenticity. I happened to ask him whether at the time of the Beilis trial the Police Department thought of utilising the "Protocols of Sion." He laughed and answered, "Why, no. Though some people did suggest to us to make use of them, we knew very well that that would mean for certain that we should ruin the whole affair. You know they are an obvious forgery. We couldn't let ourselves be put to shame as much as that. Could you really go to court with documents of that kind?" "Then you don't doubt that they were a forgery?" "Of course," said Beletsky, "if we had admitted that they were not a forgery, don't you think we should have used them at the Beilis trial and afterwards?"<sup>5</sup>

During the War, after a new sojourn abroad, I again found myself in Petersburg at the end of 1915 and was able to meet other important representatives of the Police Department. Entirely trusting me, they often gave the most interesting political information. Several times we got talking of the "Protocols." I had intimate conversations on politics with Manuilov, attached to the Police Department,<sup>6</sup> who when on service in Paris had been very well acquainted with Rachkovsky and all the chief men of the Police Department precisely in those years when the "Protocols"

<sup>5</sup> Beletsky was shot by the Bolsheviks, but Burtsev escaped.—ED.

<sup>6</sup> Manuilov acted as a kind of unofficial secretary to the Russian Prime Minister, Sturmer in 1916. Under the Bolsheviks, he helped Burtsev to escape from Russia, but himself was shot.—ED.

were being forged there. Later reports often accused him of having composed these "Protocols" himself. Whenever I talked with him he spoke of them as an obvious forgery made by Rachkovsky in Paris with the help of Golovinsky. He spoke of both of them as professional provocators who worked at the forgery of documents.

From the Kiev trial up to the triumph of the Bolsheviks in Russia, no one thought it possible in fighting the Jews to make use of the "Protocols of Sion", in spite of the fact that from the beginning of the War anti-semitism had made considerable progress in Russia and the Bolsheviks had come to be confused with the Jews.

Thus we may establish the complete failure of the "Protocols of Sion" for the first twenty years after their fabrication. Abroad, for all those years, no one heard anything about them; while in Russia people, of course, knew of their existence and one or other of the anti-semites even saw the "Protocols" in print, but all the same, outside specially anti-semitic circles, no one was interested in them. They were simply ignored as rubbish.

During 1918 I came to be convinced that the anti-semites were beginning to conduct a vigorous propaganda for the "Protocols." At that time they received powerful support from the indignation felt in wide sections of the whole population against the Bolsheviks. Among these there were many Jews—such as Trotsky, Zinovyev, Kamenev—and the anti-semites made use of this to confuse the Bolsheviks with the Jews. Thus their indignation against the Jews met with great attention and sympathy. They utilised this to make several new editions of the "Protocols."

Some of the anti-semites working in Russia soon settled abroad. There they found lively support among the anti-semites of Western Europe, and accepted the "Protocols" as genuine or at least pretended to do so, and made of them their banner. The Russian anti-semites with their "Protocols" were warmly welcomed abroad first of all by the Germans—on one hand by William II, on the other by Hitler. Hitler had then already begun his anti-semitic propaganda, and in his famous book, *Mein Kampf*, he upheld all the accusations against the Jews which were in the "Protocols." Almost at the same time they met with a warm welcome from the anti-semites in England, and articles on them appeared even in *The Times*. They were also welcomed in France, in America, in Poland and so on.

By this time we were really confronted with a real menace by the "Protocols." It was only now that we, who had always



regarded them as a forgery, thought it necessary to engage in an open and systematic struggle against them, and we came out against them with the sharpest criticism. Soon there followed an event which we had not expected and which might earlier have appeared to us even improbable. In *The Times*, where so recently the "Protocols" had been spoken of as an important anti-semitic document, there was printed an exposure of enormous importance. It brought incontrovertible proofs that the "Protocols" were an undoubted plagiarism from the book of the French lawyer Joly, published in 1864, which had no relation to the Jewish question. It seemed to all that this discovery ended all question as to the "Protocols," and that no longer would a single conscientious and self-respecting person, even if he were the most extreme anti-semite, ever attribute them to the authorship of some mysterious "Elders of Sion." But soon we saw that, in spite of the categorical proofs that the "Protocols" were a plagiarism, none the less anti-semites, as before, continued to make them the main foundation for their fight against the Jews.

For this reason I not only did not break off the war I was waging at that time against the "Protocols," but on the contrary developed it vigorously and sought new arguments to expose them. I knew that the best material could be found among anti-Bolsheviks connected with the former Police Department and with the Secret Russian Police; so it was on that side that I directed my inquiries. Before the War I had conducted a systematic campaign against the Russian Secret Police and its Police Department, and I had good information about them. This had allowed me to make important exposures of secret agents, which at one time attracted the attention, not only of the whole of the Russian public, the Russian press and the Government, but also abroad.<sup>7</sup>

From that time for several years in my investigation of the "Protocols" I addressed myself to secret agents, who alone in my opinion could know something about them, and asked them to conduct just such an investigation apart from myself. I told them that if they liked themselves to publish the results of their discoveries, they could do it wherever they pleased and in whatever form, whether for a refutation of the "Protocols" or to prove their genuineness; and now, after several years of my own investigation, I can say that I have not received from a single one of the defenders

<sup>7</sup> Beletsky has put it on record that Burtsev, by publishing the names of the principal secret Russian agents abroad, had compelled the Police Department to change radically their personnel.—Ed.

of the "Protocols" any proof whatever of their authenticity, and none of those who heard my challenge has come out himself to refute me. On the contrary from those who were close to the Police Department I have in these years several times heard unvarying and categorical statements that the "Protocols" are a forgery and that they were fabricated in Paris by Rachkovsky, and that therefore the Russian Government did not pay any attention to them.

After the exposure in *The Times* direct protests against the "Protocols" appeared in all the European press. In America, for instance, the journalist, Hermann Bernstein, came out with a refutation of them. Afterwards he prosecuted the motor king, Ford, who had defended the "Protocols" in his organ. Bernstein not only won his suit against Ford, but—what is more important—under the influence of public opinion, Ford declared in the press that he had come to the conclusion that the "Protocols" were a forgery and had given instructions to his paper no longer to defend them, and had ordered the destruction of a pamphlet in their defence issued by his press.<sup>8</sup>

The propaganda of the "Protocols," which had begun in 1920, lost something of its sharpness although it had not stopped. This campaign of the anti-semites throughout the world was especially reinforced in 1933, when in Germany the power was seized by the most convinced anti-semite, Hitler, who had concerned himself with the "Protocols" for ten years past. He at once devoted the whole government apparatus of a powerful Empire to propaganda of the "Protocols." They were printed in millions of copies for circulation throughout the world. Their danger then became clearer to us than ever.

In 1933 my literary work several times took me from Paris to Belgium, where I met persons very well versed in questions of anti-semitism. They supplied me with very useful information as to the anti-semitic agitation begun by Hitler, and I was resolved to work as hard as I could to combat the "Protocols."

From that time I approached many persons with my inquiries, I got especially valuable information from one, K, through whom I conducted a correspondence with General G., his former chief, who had been at the head of the Petersburg Okhrana (Secret Police). I put my questions to General G. through him and they were answered. General G., as I had long known, in spite of his

<sup>8</sup> *The International Jew: the World's Foremost Problem.* (Dearborn Publishing Co., U.S.A.), Nov. 1920, see especially Chapters x-xiv and *Jewish Activities in the United States (ibid.)*, Ap. 1921.

conservatism and monarchism, flatly denied the authenticity of the "Protocols." He knew very well that they were the work of agents of the Okhrana and that at the time the Okhrana itself was quite hostile to them and so was the Tsar.

When I had finished my inquiry from General G., there took place an event of great importance to me. I learned that the Jews in Bern had started a lawsuit against the publishers of the "Protocols" and that their case would be heard in Bern. I was invited to appear as a witness in this trial. The first session of the court was in 1933. The case came up again in October 1934, and was completed later in May 1935. The presiding judge was Meyer; the lawyers, Brunschwig and Matti, for the plaintiffs, and Reuf for the defendants. The experts for the plaintiffs were Loosli and Brunschwig, and for the defence Fleischhauer. The first time the court sat only for three days, the second for fifteen. The speeches were heated on both sides. Lawyers and experts on both sides spoke not for hours, but for whole days; Fleischhauer, defending the "Protocols," spoke for five days on end. They had spent nearly two years in preparation for this forensic battle, and sought arguments on all sides: the plaintiffs to expose the "Protocols," the defence to establish that they were genuine, or at least to raise doubts as to the charge of forgery. Nothing was left out that could be said for or against the "Protocols." To anyone who was not definitely interested in defending them it was clear that the attack won a complete victory. It was proved to be impossible that the "Protocols" could have been written by Jews and was shown that they were written by their enemies to compromise them. The speeches in defence consisted of the fullest repetition of all anti-semitic charges, including all the fables about ritual murders. In general, no proofs whatever were given and only assertions that the anti-semites believed all these charges to be true.

A strong impression was produced at the trial by the evidence of the witnesses, both Russian and Jewish. Among the Russians were the distinguished Russian historian and politician, Professor Milyukov; the former commissary of the Provisional Government, Professor S. G. Svatikov; the well-known Russian historian, B. I. Nikolayevsky; the author of this article; and a well-known Russo-Jewish public man, the lawyer G. B. Sliozberg, author of a serious study of the lot of the Jews in Russia.<sup>9</sup>

At the trial, evidence was given by Jews with European

<sup>9</sup> Sliozberg's study of the legal conditions of Jews under Tsardom is probably the best and most objective work on the subject.—ED.

reputations. Among them were some who had taken part in that Congress of Basel at which, according to the anti-semites, the “ Protocols ” had been drawn up. Especial attention was paid to the evidence of the President of the World Zionist Organisation, Dr. C. Weizmann; the chief Rabbi in Stockholm, one of the best known Jewish thinkers, Dr. Ehrenpreis; the late deputy of the Roumanian parliament, leader of the local Zionists who had taken part in all the sittings of the Congress of Basel in 1897, Dr. Meyer-Ebner; a well-known lawyer of Zürich and member of the National Council, Dr. Farbstein; one of the old workers of Zionism, former President of the Zionist Organisation in Germany who had also taken part in the Basel Congress, Dr. Bodenheimer; and others.

Among the witnesses was also a Frenchman, the Marquis du Chayla, who had lived a long time in Russia and had been in constant connection there with one of the chief propagandists of the “ Protocols,” Nilus. He contributed his interesting recollections of his acquaintance with this strange mystic.

The evidence of all these witnesses showed that the “ Protocols ” were composed by agents of the Russian Okhrana, namely, Rachkovsky and Golovinsky and that they could not have had anything to do with the Jews, that the witnesses regarded them as undoubtedly a plagiarism, and it was established that they were founded on the book of Joly.

The defence of the “ Protocols ” put up only one witness, the fanatical anti-semite Dr. A. Zander, who did not offer any proofs whatever but only with his usual confidence repeated that he believed in the genuineness of the “ Protocols ”; but that, even if it was proved to him that they were a forgery, for him these “ Protocols ” all the same expressed the views of the Jews.

The first session in November 1933 was taken up only with defining the question of the “ Protocols.” No evidence was given and neither party raised the fundamental question. I was not present at this session and only know about it from the newspaper reports, but at the second and third sessions I was present throughout. They made a very profound impression on me. It was an absolute triumph of the opponents of the “ Protocols.” The anti-semites found themselves in a very unpleasant position.

Judge Meyer gave his decision as follows:—“ I declare that absolutely no proofs have been given to establish the genuineness of the ‘ Protocols.’ The fact remains incontestable; the ‘ Protocols ’ are a plagiarism of the book of Maurice Joly. This became known in 1921 through the articles in *The Times*. If this had been the sole

result of this trial—for this fact is admitted by the accused—its results would then be very important; for after that it is impossible to conceal the real origin of the ‘Protocols.’ On my side, as judge I regard the ‘Protocols of the Elders of Sion’ as a forgery, a plagiarism, and nonsense.” The other side made an appeal. The case was again argued in Bern in the autumn of 1937. The attitude of the Court on the question of the “Protocols” remained the same; but if at the first trial it had charged the publishers of the “Protocols” as publishers of immoral literature, in the court of appeal the “Protocols” were treated as mischievous political literature, exciting one part of the population against another.

Since the Bern trial the controversy on the “Protocols” goes on. Among the propagandists of the “Protocols,” there are even still some who repeat that they are genuine. But for the most part even their most stubborn defenders avoid putting the actual question whether they are genuine or not. They feel that to defend the authenticity of the “Protocols” is impossible, and only emphasise that, even if they were composed by anti-semites to discredit the Jews, all the same they are a true expression of Jewish views and objects. Thus, from now onwards all propaganda of the “Protocols” is of an openly dishonest character, which, as a matter of fact, it always was before.

In Germany it is now impossible to say a word to refute the “Protocols.” There they have, as before, the widest circulation; they are officially recognised as genuine; and from Germany are sent out enormous sums to spread them throughout the world, to provoke an anti-semitic movement everywhere.

VL. BURTSEV.

# POLAND'S FOREIGN RELATIONS

## III. POLAND AND HER BIG NEIGHBOURS

THE Polish state came into being a thousand years ago. From the start it had to face pressure coming both from the west and from the east. One of the first bits of history we have is a notice in the chronicle of the Saxon monk, Widukind, to the effect that in the year 967 A.D. Mieszko I became lord of the mouth of the Oder. The moment Poland's main forces were engaged in the west, the Rurik Vladimir of Kíev, as we learn from the chronicle of Nestor, "set out against the Lachs, and took their fortress of Przemyśl and others." The real danger came at that time from the west. When he realised that, as a pagan prince he could only be the object of attack of German policy, Mieszko I decided in 966 to accept Christian baptism. Already at that time the purpose of Polish policy was to ensure the absolute sovereignty of the State. It moved Boleslav the Bold to exclude the mediation of the German Metropolitan of Magdeburg when he came to organise the Church, and then to adorn his own brows with the royal crown—symbol of complete independence (1024). Again, it gave rise a century later to the successful struggle, *pro libertate Poloniæ*, waged by Boleslav Wry-mouthed with the Emperor Henry V. Finally toward the end of the Piast period, it found expression in the proud declaration made to the Emperor Charles IV by Spytek of Melsztyn

"My lord (Kazimierz the Great) is not subject either to the Emperor or to the Pope."

Nevertheless German pressure succeeded, during the time of the Piasts, in cutting Poland off from the Baltic; and for a century and a half Pomerania was the domain of the German Order of Crusaders. What the Piasts had not been able to hold, that the Jagiellons restored. By the Treaty of Toruń in 1466 the sea-board returned to Poland, and Polish-German frontiers were stabilised for over three hundred years. Thanks to the Reformation and to internal divisions any threat to Poland from the side of the Germans ceased for a longer period.

Poland's main attention was turned toward the east, to Moscow, where from 1547 Ivan the Terrible ruled as Tsar of all the Russias. Russia was advancing westward, toward the Bug, while Poland was defending the line of the Dnieper. The struggle went on for two centuries, with varying fortunes. Meanwhile, to the west and the north, with Berlin and Königsberg as centres, Prussia grew an absolute monarchy, placing its highest hopes in the soldier-qualities

of its sons. To the south Poland had the absolutist Habsburg realm. Russia, of course, was just Russia.

And Poland? When the Jagiellon line died out in 1572 there followed a period of elective monarchy. The nobility was proud of this system, holding it to be the symbol of freedom and the model of constitutional perfection. Even Jan Zamoyski, chancellor of King Stephen Batory, flattered the nobles, comparing their system to the Roman one. The *szlachta* were said to be like the Roman patricians. The chancellor forgot that in Rome there was a single strong authority watching over the interests of the State, and able to compel obedience in the name of the common good. This principle of equality in Poland killed political talent, and all honourable ambitions. The egoism of the ruling class contributed neither to a strengthening of the royal power, nor to securing the Treasury, nor to the defence of the State. The Commonwealth wallowed in internal disorders, and had no foreign policy at all. No one feared it, No one sought it as an ally. The Partitions—1772, 1792, 1795, were a violation and a crime, but they are not explained by superior force alone. The chief cause of the fall of Poland rests in her own sons : a fact that is clearly seen by the generation that has recovered independence, and is now responsible for the organisation of the new State.

#### I.

For over a century our insurrections and efforts at liberation failed. We were weaker than any of the Powers that partitioned us, and "the Polish Question" could not become an international one so long as all three were in agreement. At the end of the last century the hour sounded of the rending of this agreement, and it was replaced by far-reaching rivalries. The Franco-Russian alliance sowed discord among the watchers at the grave of Polish statehood. Not that it was meant to do this, for it was only an application of the principle that "our neighbours' neighbours are our allies." There were sentimental Poles who said that the alliance was monstrous, that it deprived us of all hopes. But people with political minds reasoned otherwise :

"At last," they said, "the war of the peoples will come, for which Mickiewicz prayed. At last the struggle will come, in which the three partitioning Powers will be engaged, but in two camps !"

It was not by chance, that on the day when the Armistice was signed at Rethondes (11 Nov. 1918), the German occupants in Warsaw were disarmed, and steps were taken for the first proper government in an independent Poland. And for this reason, that

the victory of the Allies was one of the necessary and positive factors making possible the restoration of a truly independent and united Poland. With it reckoned both the "independent" camp of Pilsudski and the "coalition" camp of Roman Dmowski, which means the overwhelming majority of the nation. The Austrophil group went bankrupt before the war was over. Of a Germanophil group there could be no thought, seeing that in Germany there were no friends of Poland.

The other positive factor, making for the emancipation of Poland, was the steadily growing succession of changes in the dynastic States of the continent. Artificially built States were crumbling, while the nations were stirring to a new life, were growing in population, and were enriching themselves both materially and spiritually. As the Great War increased its dimensions, statesmen came to see more clearly that the justest peace in Europe would be one based on national States. This idea found its most influential and disinterested champion in Woodrow Wilson.

Alongside these positive factors, we should mention two negative ones: the policy of Berlin, and that of Tsardom. The insincere and unreliable promises made to the Poles by the Tsars arose from two chief motives. The army leaders wanted to assure themselves of the goodwill of the people whose lands were the theatre of war in the east in 1914-18, and the diplomats took the stand that the Polish question concerned only Russia. They sought to provide proofs that the Tsar of all the Russias was doing his duty by the Poles, and that his allies did not need to give a further thought to the matter. The hypocrisy of this game was so evident that Milyukov could not avoid branding it in his Manifesto of 30 March 1917. Scarcely a year before that he had taken the old view; but in this document of the short-lived Provisional Government he departed from it, though not without reservations. Then came the Communist turnover with the sundering of Russia from the anti-German coalition. Russian policy during the Great War was a negative factor in the restoration of Poland because, although no Russian government showed real concern for our well-being, nevertheless Polish policy had distinct gains from Russian actions and events. The chiefest of these was the Revolution, which Polish thought had foreseen and had constantly in mind.

As for German policy during the war, it also was insincere. It oscillated between two mutually exclusive possibilities. On the one hand Bismarck's idea of a separate peace with Russia over the body of Poland held both generals and politicians in its grip, on the



other we had flashes of the German liberalism of 1830-1848, aiming at the setting-up of an independent Poland between Germany and Russia. Before the revolution in Russia the two things were resolved into one. Desiring to secure for their ends Polish "cannon-fodder," the Germans created on 5 November 1916, a weird "Polish State" with neither frontiers nor government. After the Russian upheaval, when the hope of a Polish army had ceased to be real and German imperialism in the east began to take concrete forms, Berlin would not and could not withdraw from the November arrangement, for tactical reasons. It even had to agree to the act of 12 September 1917, which provided for a Regency and for calling into being a Polish "government." No one attached much importance to this, however, since the said "government" was not even allowed to be represented at the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk.

There would not have arisen a free and united Poland if the Allied powers *and* Russia had won the war. Nor would there have been a free and united Poland had the Central Powers won. Does that mean that either of these possibilities would have meant the burying of our hopes and the end of our plans? Of course not. This is not understood by German historians who say that the restoration of Poland was only possible "thanks to a series of accidents, which so fortunately coincided." Such a thesis is superficial, and is too congenial to be true. Chance plays, without doubt, a certain rôle in human reckonings. It can hasten or delay historical processes, but it cannot stop their march. "The restoration of the Polish State was not an accident at all" said Hitler in January 1935. As an eminent statesman and a shrewd psychologist, the Chancellor realised how the general will of the Polish people, which thought of itself as a single family in spite of generations of separation, was the outstanding fact that decided as to the restoration of the State. Here we have the internal factor in the whole matter, more powerful than all external ones taken together, whether positive or negative.

The leaders of the Polish nation never despaired of the restoration of the State, and they anticipated the factors involved. They knew full well that the nation, which had grown from eight to over twenty millions during its subjection, was ripe for regaining its independence and for taking its affairs into its own hands. But neither the Germans nor the Russians knew this, nor did the French and English. When the war came, Polish leaders knew that, whatever happened, the result would be advantageous to Poland; but, cautious in their forecasts, they divided its rebuilding into stages. The one group

wanted first independence, the other wanted reunion. But all were agreed that Poland should not await the outcome with folded hands; all felt that they would reach the goal easier and sooner if they took an active part in it. The struggle lasted long enough to allow them to uncover their cards one by one. It transpired that Dmowski, who at the start demanded a united Poland within the framework of an undefined union with Russia, was no less a worker for independence than Pilsudski. It transpired also that Pilsudski, who at first thought only of independence, passing over for the moment the restoration of Prussian Poland, was as much for a united Poland as was Dmowski.

The new State, built on the lands of an ancient nation which never ceased to live and grow and struggle, lies once more between Powers stronger than itself—on the east the Soviet Union, on the west Germany. So it was of old, so it is today. Our western frontier, fixed in 1919-21, does not differ much from that of 1772. It is a frontier *par excellence* national: one on which the Peace Conference centred its greatest attention, deciding all doubtful details in favour of the Germans. Our eastern frontier, though resulting from the Polish victory over the "Red Army," is a proof of Polish moderation. We could have had more in the Treaty of Riga in 1921; yet we did not think of the Dnieper, and accepted a line running to the west of Minsk and of Kamieniec Podolski. We wanted the Polish nation to have an absolute preponderance in the new State.

It is Poland's destiny to live between the Germans and Russia. Our foreign policy is the expression of this situation. All our relations are subordinated to it. In a duel we might measure our strength with either of these neighbours, and the battle would not be hopeless. Who can estimate how much strength is given to the attacked party by the consciousness that he is fighting for existence, and in what degree the thrust of the attacking party is lessened by the knowledge that he is fighting for another's soil, on which an ancient and civilised people dwells? It would be better, of course, if no such duel should arise. Should it be unavoidable, it would be desirable that its limits be extended. On the other hand, against the united forces of Germany and Russia, Poland could do little. This geographical reality, reinforced by the experiences of the past, places Polish foreign policy before a double task: (i) of not permitting our two neighbours to unite against us, and (ii) of assuring ourselves of help in case of a war with either of them.

## 2.

There are no axioms in the foreign policy of Poland which command us to remain in an uncompromisingly hostile attitude to Germany. Such a policy could be commended only by those who can find us partners in such a war in Europe. There are, however, no such to be found. No Great Power bases its relations with Germany on such a fatal axiom as this. If such a principle were the determining factor in our policy, we should weaken with our own hands our international position; and we should give advantages to strangers, for which our only reward would be far from complimentary opinions about our political sense. Poland's interests do not at all demand that her relations with Germany should be bad. In a sincere striving for the maintenance of peace, we have desired and desire today agreement with all our neighbours. From the moment of the fixing of our frontiers, we have sought the relief of tension and a peaceful *modus vivendi* with the Germans. Of course, not at any price. For peace we offer peace, for loyalty loyalty, for friendship the same. As Alexander Skrzyński said in Warsaw, in the Foreign Affairs Committee of the Diet, on 26 February 1925—speaking as Foreign Minister of Poland:

“In our minds is the will to concrete negotiations on the (Commercial) Treaty; and we believe that soon . . . it will lead to establishing principles for the exchange of goods, that will be the basis for further understandings and helpful collaboration.”

His successor in office, August Zaleski, used these words in the same Committee on 21 July 1926:

“The web of interests uniting Poland with the Reich demands . . . that between these lands there should prevail permanent peaceful co-operation. Poland frankly desires to base her relations with Germany on concrete foundations, and to build thereon the normal conditions of neighbourliness.”

The same Minister said on 18 February 1930, in the Foreign Affairs Committee of the Senate:

“Polish-German understanding is in line with the policy consistently pursued by our Government. It aims at a definitive stabilising of relations and mentalities in Central Europe, which would then be the surest and most effective guarantee of lasting peace.”

These and other appeals fell on unfavourable soil in Berlin. If an answer was vouchsafed, its tone was ironical. If something like political “conversations” were started from the German side,

conditions were broached which Poland could only reject. As early as 1926 Pilsudski realised that the Weimar phase of Polish-German relations was just nonsense. He knew that, as long as inner discord was rife among the German parties, while every man was at war with his neighbour, and neither programme nor Government could be sure of a majority in the Reichstag, the only basis for agreement with Berlin would be the unsound one of unacceptable revision of frontiers. So the diplomatic offensive of the German Republic against Poland led to nothing. No amount of talk could convince the Poles that they should seek reconciliation with Germany at the price of giving up their outlet to the sea, or of handing back even the smallest bit of ancient Polish territory, most justly set free in 1919. This talk the Weimar Republic could not back up with arms. We do not know whether anyone in Berlin thought seriously at that time of a trial of force. Probably no one of importance; and the other "party" to Rapallo was not an ally. For that matter there was a growing opposition in Berlin to any collaboration with the Soviets—and rightly. It would have threatened the end of a national German State.

Stresemann fancied that he was treading in the footprints of Bismarck. He did not realise that the conditions were fundamentally different. The policy of the Iron Chancellor was "real," in seeking through the co-operation of two nationalist dynasties and two territorial imperialisms mutual guarantees for keeping the *status quo*, and for giving both diplomacies freedom of movement. The notions of Brockdorff-Rantzau or Maltzahn that by collaboration with the *Comintern* they might repair "the evil done the Germans at Versailles" was naïve. Adolf Hitler, on the other hand, even before he came into power, knew that by leaving Moscow as the source of European unrest and not tying itself in any way to this state-international, Germany would best avoid being penned in and would open the way to peaceful collaboration with other nations. The reinforcing of this conviction in the Reich was parallel if not identical with the growth of the National Socialist movement.

In June 1932, Baron Neurath, Ambassador in London, and only just made Foreign Minister in Berlin, visited the Polish Ambassador at the Court of St. James, Konstanty Skirmunt, just before leaving for his new post. The visit was one of courtesy, made by one colleague to another on departure. But in the course of conversation the Baron said:

"Relations between our two countries are quite unreasonable. It is time to change them . . . ."

"You are now going to the post" was the answer "in which much may be done to change them."

But the Cabinet of Herr von Papen had too little authority in Germany to be able to bring about a proper change of conditions between Germany and Poland. The same was true of that of General von Schleicher, the last cabinet before the Nazi revolution. It is, nevertheless, a significant event, that even von Schleicher sought to make a contact with Marshal Pilsudski with the help of a Polish general—certainly with not much sincere desire of success.

The statement that Pilsudski was waiting for Hitler would sound too much like a justification after the event. The situation in the Reich was not clear. Many observers on the spot at the beginning of 1932 gave a negative answer to the question: Will the Nazi leader attain to power? Still it is a fact that when Briand asked the Polish Marshal in Geneva in December 1927, what he thought of the future of Polish-German relations, the reply was prophetic:

"Today our relations are very cool. I do not doubt, however, that someone will come to power in Germany in a few years, a statesman who will understand that two Powers like these, in the interests of both, should find the way to neighbourly relations, based on mutual respect and confidence."

In telling me about this some time later Briand added with a sceptical smile:

"Pourvu que votre Maréchal ait raison!"

The Marshal's forecast became a fact. On 30 January 1933, just such a statesman came into power in Berlin. At last Pilsudski, who had sought relief of the tension with Germany, had a partner. But the attempt did not go on oiled wheels. The history of the year 1933 in Polish-German relations would call for a special study<sup>1</sup>. On 26 January 1934, did come, at last, the historic crisis between the two nations. A pact of non-aggression for ten years was signed between them, closing the post-war period of mutual dislike and of barren rivalry. Both governments came to the conclusion that "the time had come for beginning a new period through direct negotiations of one party with the other." This new period has now lasted more than four years, and it can be expected to last for more than the decade set down. In this optimism we are justified not only by the "tests of reliability" already passed, not only by the further proclamation of 5 November 1937, in regard to Minorities, but also by the certainty that neither in Berlin nor in Warsaw will the resolve

<sup>1</sup> Cf., *Foreign Affairs* (N.Y.C.), July, 1935, pp. 647-665.

weaken, further to develop and improve the relations between the two peoples, on the lines and in the spirit of the "Declaration for the Rejection of Force" of January 1934.

Thanks to the "new period" the issue of the "corridor" has ceased to exist; and the conclusion on 15 July 1937 of the Geneva Convention, which had created a special régime *ad interim* in the plebiscite area of Upper Silesia, passed by without upheavals—almost unobserved. What was formerly described as "intolerable" has become quite a normal matter. The Free City of Danzig, more than once likened by the journalists to "a powder-cask," has also ceased to exist as an "issue" between Poland and Germany. This has been confirmed by Hitler in his speech of 20 February 1938, who said:

"The Polish State respects the national loyalties of Danzig, and the Free City and Germany respect the rights of Poles."

These and other gains, won by Poland from the normalising of her relations with Germany, are not—let us make clear, one-sided. Only such relations are lasting as are advantageous to both sides. What has the Reich gained? In the first case, the settlement with Poland was the first bi-lateral settlement made by the Third Reich with a neighbour. Pilsudski, one of the first statesmen of his time, esteemed the attainment of power by Hitler as the victory of an idea and an organisation, and as something that will last. The settlement with Poland was thus a model for others to follow, and the confidence shown by Poland in the Third Reich has been a very potent factor in the international prestige of Germany. Further, the relief of the tension with Poland gave more freedom of movement in German politics, whether in the realising of equality in the field of armaments or in the campaign for national rights of the ten million Germans "living in the two countries bordering with the Reich." Finally, thanks to this new period in her relations with Germany, Poland could remain indifferent to the various projects for pacts of mutual help, which belong to the field of "collective security."

### 3.

In dealing with Poland's relations with her eastern neighbour, we may start from the same principles as regulate our relations with Germany. Here, too, Polish foreign policy has no fundamental axioms, which would have to create between her and the Soviet Union an atmosphere of hostility. Bad relations with Russia do not lie in the Polish interest. In spite of this, with the exception of a

short period from early in 1932 to 1934, these relations have not been good. Why is it?

Above all, for this reason, that our eastern neighbour is not "Russia," i.e. a national Russian State. It is true that she never was. Even in Tsarist times the nation did not rule in Russia, for there never was a politically ripe social order in the European sense of that word. The Tsar was surrounded by a court camarilla. He rested his strength on the bureaucracy, the army and the church. Nevertheless the Russian Tsars definitely did represent in a certain sense nationalism. They united the territories from Kalisz to Kamchatka, from the Arctic to Afghanistan. Tsarist Russia devoured everything, but it assimilated only peoples more primitive than the Russians. Though already a monster creation, it dreamed still of Constantinople, of an outlet on the Adriatic—through Jugoslavia, and into the heart of Europe through Czechoslovakia. Unable to bear the burden of a long war, it came down in ruin in 1917, a collapse which surprised only people who knew Russian affairs but superficially. The Provisional Government could not take the place of Tsardom, and for two reasons. First, because the group of élite patriots fit to take the reins of Government into their hands was too small and too much divided. Secondly, this group did not understand that the one condition of remaining in power was immediate peace and land reform. Seeking to carry on the war, this Government dug its own grave and made easier the work of Lenin.

Thanks to the war and to the foolishness of his opponents, this grim genius, who stood at the head of a small group of fanatics (among them a large percentage of non-Russians, hating Tsardom), carried through a communist revolution in a country least of all prepared for such a turnover. For that matter, even today in the lands of what was Russia there is no "Communist régime" in the strict sense of the word. What one has, is a hundred-per-cent. *étatisme*, or if you like, a state interventionism so all-powerful, that by comparison with it, German or Italian *autarkie* is pure liberalism.

If the Soviet régime limited itself only to the economic side of life, it could not have very far-reaching influence on the foreign policy of the Union. However, the USSR is neither a national nor a nationalist state. Although the constitution of the Empire governed from Moscow has no earmarks specifically communist, that city is nevertheless the capital of the Communist International, whose revolutionary activities can be identified the world over. Is Moscow first and foremost the seat of the *Comintern*, for which the

USSR is only a territorial starting place for further enterprises? Or, is Moscow first and foremost the seat of the Soviet government, for which the *Comintern* is on the one hand a powerful instrument for action abroad, and on the other a passport to Leninist orthodoxy at home? These two questions represent two seemingly different theses. To trouble one's head as to which of the two is the right one, would be as hopeless a task as the memorable debate up to 1927 over the question, who in Moscow was for a peace policy—Stalin or Trotsky. The fact is that the struggle between these men was above all one of two characters, and that man won who was more progressive and uncompromising. They differed as to the prospects of success in the collectivisation of the villages, but not as to the problem “of the introducing of socialism in the country and its relations to capitalism all round.” Only naive inhabitants of western Europe could see in Trotsky a romantic revolutionary, but in Stalin a realist statesman concerned with smelting out a sort of “Soviet nation” in a melting-pot of Five Year Plans; or a sort of new democracy, ready to co-operate peacefully with the other nations of the world, and to organise with them collective security, in the womb of the League of Nations. At bottom both Stalin and Trotsky were and are convinced that in the lands of the former Russian Empire a socialist structure has little chance of permanence and success, so long as it is surrounded by a world of capitalism. It looks as though Trotsky took the view that one should not delay in bringing help to the peasants and workmen of other lands in their struggle with their own bourgeoisie. Stalin thought that one should first develop the Red Army, and prepare the Soviet economic structure for war. Meantime, Soviet diplomacy was to do its work.

Whatever the political colour of the State which stands in the place of the Russian Empire, it does maintain a system of security. The cardinal principle of this system of today is the breaking up of European solidarity. From a disunited Europe there is no chance of a crusading expedition moving on Moscow, with a view to restoring capitalism in the lands of the White Tsar. Reversely in a Europe at variance with itself, there might easily break out a new war; and the Red Tsar would then have the finest prospects of introducing everywhere a socialist structure. The absolute impossibility of separating Soviet *raison d'état* from the revolutionary work of the *Comintern* on the one hand, and this policy of security on the other—these are the two chief difficulties in the way of bringing about normal neighbourly relations between Poland and the Soviet Union. There is no lack of people in Europe, who say that there are no real differences



between the Fascist régimes and the Soviet Union. This is a very shallow view. Those who take it see certain external and mechanical similarities, but do not observe the deep inner differences. Fascism is at bottom a modern form of nationalism. Communism is the denial of this. German National Socialism is trying to carry on propaganda among the German minority in Poland, but it never thinks of attacking the national character of the State. On the other hand it desires that this be strengthened. Not a day passes, however, that Polish police do not arrest a few communists sent out and supported by Moscow, whose chief mission is to destroy the national character of Poland, to proclaim a Soviet Republic, and to incorporate it in the Soviet Union. Thus we see that between our two chief neighbours there are differences, which sufficiently well explain this obvious fact. that although the Polish Government sincerely desires to maintain with both her neighbours equally correct and friendly relations, in practice those with Germany are better than those with the Soviet Union. Between Poland and the Third Reich *political* conflicts are possible in the future. The complete contradiction existing between the national and Catholic character of the Polish state and the philosophy of life propagated by the Soviet Union leaves us no choice but a conflict *of ideas* with Communism. It goes without saying that Polish policy is doing all it can to keep this conflict from becoming a war.

On the morrow of the Peace of Riga, 18 March 1921, we were suspected by Moscow of preparing an attack on the Soviet Union in conjunction with the capitalists of western Europe. When, in May 1926, Pilsudski put an end in Poland to the party political régime, Moscow's fears were great. When the Polish Foreign Minister, August Zaleski, declared in the Foreign Committee of the Diet that Poland wished to maintain right relations with the Soviet Union and "that she does not aim at gathering about her any kind of 'bloc' turned against any of her neighbours" (21 July 1926), Moscow was wondering, why this "cunning"? In order to escape from this charmed circle of mutual suspicions, the Polish Government proposed the signing of a pact of non-aggression. The negotiations went on for six years. The reasons for this were two. First, the Soviets wanted, if possible, to weaken the Polish-Roumanian alliance, and at the same time to stir up mistrust between Poland and the smaller Baltic States. Second, the diplomatic efforts of the Weimar Republic, which saw in the conclusions of such a pact an undesirable reinforcement of the international position of Poland. All the same, the pact of non-aggression was

signed on 25 July 1932, for a term of three years. On 3 July 1933, the two powers bound themselves by a Convention, which set out in the greatest detail the definition of an "aggressor." Finally, on 5 May 1934, the Polish and Soviet Governments prolonged the period of the pact of non-aggression till the end of 1945.

Poland has held and still holds, that these international treaties, whose positive value was emphasised by the visit of Colonel Beck to Moscow in February 1934, are sufficient proof of her goodwill, of her love of peace, and of her wish to maintain with the Soviet Union normal neighbourly relations. Moscow, indeed, took a different view. The lessening of the tension with Poland was for her only a prelude to a further undertaking, in keeping with the Soviet system of security. She wanted to find for us a place in a greater alliance, meant to hem in the Germany of Hitler. In this "cordon of gendarmes" we were to play the part of the advance guard of the Red army. This task we could not possibly accept. What did surprise Polish opinion, however, was the fact that certain statesmen in Paris at one time advocated the Soviet plan for this cordon of gendarmes.

4.

Throughout all our history, Poland has been bound by deeper and lasting sentiments only to two countries—France and Hungary. Our cordial feelings toward the former were never quenched by any political disappointments, for which, of course, both sides must share the responsibility. Francis I was ready to form with Poland an alliance in the 16th century, but Sigismund I limited himself to a vacillating foreign policy. The second attempt at a Polish-French alliance came with the offering of the throne in 1572 to Henry of Valois, and ended with a humiliation for Poland. When Richelieu offered Warsaw an alliance in the following century, Ladislas IV did not appreciate it, for he had his head full of thoughts about the Swedish throne. A generation later Louis XIV wanted an alliance with Sobieski; but the arrogance of the French king and the intrigues of Queen Marysienka thrust Sobieski into the hands of the Habsburgs, and Polish blood was spilt before Vienna. In the 18th century Poland was so weak that she could not be an ally in the proper sense of the word. For the diplomats of Louis XV, what Poland could offer was only one of a number of not too certain advantages, which could be sacrificed if necessary. Napoleon deceived the Poles with his promises, used them freely for his purposes, did not restore the Polish State, and later—on St. Helena, sincerely regretted it. It was, further, a wholly natural thing that

during the insurrections of 1830 and 1863 France did not come to our aid. What power would let loose a European war in defence of an issue not concerning it directly, even though it lay very near to its heart?

After 1871 the fear of Germany was the chief factor in French foreign policy. The greatest possible weakening of Germany was thus, at the time of the world war, France's chief aim. This found expression at the Peace Conference, in the desire to take from the Reich the whole territory west of the Rhine, as well as all Polish lands and even Schleswig. As for Poland, up to the Russian revolution, France conducted herself with great caution. Even on 11 March 1917, Briand signed with Izvolsky a secret agreement, by which France recognised the thesis of the Tsar's diplomats that the fate of Poland should be decided by Russia alone. Not till after the revolution did France free herself from this position, and decide to take the Polish question entirely into her own hands. Even the Polish National Committee, organised by Dmowski in August 1917, had to make it clear more than once that for Poland an international agreement in respect of all decisions was more desirable than any move made by France alone.

If it had depended on the French exclusively, Poland would have attained at the Peace Conference all her territorial demands which affected Germany. We could not however count on the French in regard to our eastern frontiers. Here Franco-Polish friendship was disturbed by recollections of the former alliance with Russia and by considerations for the future. In post-war days no one in France counted on the permanence of the Soviet régime, but rather it was expected that at any time Tsarist Russia would return, and become again "a factor for order and balance in Europe." We were counselled in Paris not to annoy this Russia of the future, but to content ourselves with an eastern frontier on the Bug. Had Poland accepted this counsel, the boundary of Europe would lie not where it is today, but at Brześć Litowski!

French realists soon reconciled themselves to the facts, and as early as on 19 February 1921, a Franco-Polish political agreement was signed declaring that "for the purpose of co-ordinating their efforts for peace, both Governments bind themselves to act together in all foreign affairs that concerned both States." This political agreement was supplemented by a military Convention. Three years later, within the framework of the so-called Locarno Agreements, Poland and France concluded a further Treaty of Guarantees. This provided that, in the case of an armed attack by Germany on

either of the parties, the other will offer "immediate help and support."

The three agreements mentioned represent the formal foundation for the Franco-Polish alliance. It is justified by geography, it is explained by history, and it is enjoined by political realities. The method of carrying out an alliance is not defined by the letter of diplomatic documents, but rather by the spirit in which responsible statesmen apply those documents in practice. No Frenchman has thought or thinks today that the alliance with Poland is an adequate guarantee of the safety of this country—and rightly. So then, French diplomacy has sought out more of such *alliés de revers* in central Europe and the Balkans. It has every right to do this. Desiring, however, to keep the greatest measure of freedom of movement and to avoid any hardening of its system of security, France has also adverted to the method of reconciliation of the Germans.

For Poland, which cannot be considered a small country and which may be on the way to taking its place as a Great Power, the alliance with France is also not a complete guarantee of security. Zaleski said in the Foreign Affairs Committee of the Diet on 31 January 1930, that the desire for regulating her relations with Germany was for France something deep and natural; and he added these words: "Franco-German and Polish-German understanding are the fundamentals of political balance in Europe," they are "two parallel undertakings which can and ought soon to be realised." This parallelism did not work out, and for two reasons. In the first place Stresemann thought that by drawing near to France he could isolate Poland and compel her to yield up territory. Secondly, many eminent Frenchmen took the view that in giving Poland unasked-for advice, in neglecting her most vital interests, or even encouraging her to give in, they would help on the task of a Franco-German *rapprochement*.

Esteeming the coming to power of Hitler as a very unpleasant but passing episode, France turned her eyes upon the Soviet Union as upon a new and, in her opinion, a powerful *allié de revers*. Deeply convinced that her great friend was in error, Poland decided not to waste the opportunity, but to reach a *détente* with Germany. Refusing to join a great anti-German alliance according to the Barthou-Litvinov formula, she did everything to avoid weakening her alliance with France. Above all she expressly set down in her treaty with the Reich of 26 January 1934, that this alliance shall remain valid, and shall not be in contradiction to the new pact with Germany. Following this, when the late Louis Barthou visited

Warsaw, Colonel Beck declared in the name of the Polish Government that "the agreements uniting Poland and France are one of the strongest, most vital and most lasting factors in international peace." Our refusal to join the so-called "Eastern Pact" brought it about that for two years Paris looked on Warsaw with great coolness. Factors that were unfriendly to Poland succeeded in persuading many Frenchmen that "between Warsaw and Berlin there was more signed than was announced." They soon found that there was no justification for this belief. In the autumn of 1936, when the Commander-in-Chief of the Polish Army, Marshal Smigly-Rydz, paid an official visit in Paris, he was royally received. Diplomacy did the rest. Suspicions vanished, and people in Paris understood the constructive and general value of the normalising of Polish-German relations. *C'est un élément effectif de pacification*, was the phrase used by *Le Temps* in its leading article on 7 December, 1937. "To be just, let us admit that French opinion has desired a Polish-German *rapprochement*," added the Socialist *Populaire* on 28 December 1937. Polish-French relations are again cordial, and based on mutual confidence, but the gain from the crisis is this, that people at the Quay D'Orsay attach today more importance than they did a few years ago to the rôle of Poland in the maintenance of peace and equilibrium in Europe.

K. SMOGORZEWSKI.

## LAST PLEA OF BUKHARIN

*Note.*—Bukharin's speech before death is of special interest, not only for his eminent position among the Russian communists, but also as illustrating many of the features of the recent trials. We shall note his unreserved condemnation of his opposition to Stalin, his complete admission of active co-operation in plans for a coup d'état, and at the same time his careful qualification of the measure of his responsibility—for instance his insistent personal disclaimer of any part in a plot against the life of Lenin, or in the death of Gorky, in any connection with fascist powers and any activity in the work of wrecking. We shall also take note of his distinction between conversations which he admits and others which he denies. In particular we shall remark his warm disclaimer of various theories as to the trials (for instance that of drugs and that of the "âme slave") which have obtained currency outside Russia. Especially we shall note his unqualified tribute to the work of construction and to the spirit of the new life in Russia.—ED.

*The Commandant of the Court:* The Court is coming, please rise.

*The President:* Please be seated. The session is resumed. Accused Bukharin, you may make your last plea.

*Bukharin:* Citizen President and Citizens Judges, I fully agree with Citizen the Procurator regarding the significance of the trial, at which were exposed our dastardly crimes, the crimes committed by the "bloc of Rights and Trotskyites," one of whose leaders I was, and for all the activities of which I bear responsibility.

This trial, which is the concluding one of a series of trials, has exposed all the crimes and the treasonable activities, it has exposed the historical significance and the roots of our struggle against the Party and the Soviet government.

I have been in prison for over a year, and I therefore do not know what is going on in the world. But, judging from those fragments of real life that sometimes reached me by chance, I see, feel and understand that the interests which we so criminally betrayed are entering a new phase of gigantic development, are now appearing in the international proletarian phase.

We, the accused, are sitting on the other side of the barrier, and this barrier separates us from you, Citizens Judges. We found ourselves in the accursed ranks of the counter-revolution, became traitors to the Socialist fatherland.

At the very beginning of the trial, in answer to the question of

Citizen the President, whether I pleaded guilty, I replied by a confession.

In answer to the question of Citizen the President whether I confirmed the testimony I had given, I replied that I confirmed it fully and entirely.

When, at the end of the preliminary investigation, I was summoned for interrogation to the State Prosecutor, who controlled the sum total of the materials of the investigation, he summarised them as follows (Vol V, p. 114, 1 December 1937) :—

*Question :* Were you a member of the centre of the counter-revolutionary organisation of the Rights? I answered : Yes, I admit it.

*Second question :* Do you admit that the centre of the anti-Soviet organisation, of which you are a member, engaged in counter-revolutionary activities and set itself the aim of violently overthrowing the leadership of the Party and the government? I answered : Yes, I admit it.

*Third question :* Do you admit that this centre engaged in terrorist activities, organised kulak uprisings and prepared for Whiteguard kulak uprisings against members of the Political Bureau, against the leadership of the Party and the Soviet power? I answered : It is true.

— *Fourth question :* Do you admit that you are guilty of treasonable activities, as expressed in preparations for a conspiracy aiming at a coup d'état? I answered : Yes, that is also true.

In Court I admitted, and still admit my guilt in respect to the crimes, which I committed and of which I was accused by Citizen the State Prosecutor at the end of the Court investigation and on the basis of the materials of the investigation in the possession of the Procurator. I declared also in Court, and I stress and repeat it now, that I regard myself politically responsible for the sum total of the crimes committed by the " bloc of Rights and Trotskyites."

I have merited the most severe punishment, and I agree with Citizen the Procurator, who several times repeated that I stand on the threshold of my hour of death.

Nevertheless, I consider that I have the right to refute certain charges, which were brought : (a) In the printed Indictment, (b) during the Court investigation, and (c) in the speech for the prosecution made by Citizen the Procurator of the USSR.

I consider it necessary to mention that during my interrogation by Citizen the State Prosecutor, the latter declared in a very cate-

gorical form that I, as one of the accused, must not admit more than I had admitted, and that I must not invent facts that have never happened, and he demanded that this statement of his should be placed on the records.

I once more repeat that I admit that I am guilty of treason to the Socialist fatherland, the most heinous of possible crimes, of the organisation of kulak uprisings, of preparations for terrorist acts, and of belonging to an underground, anti-Soviet organisation. I further admit that I am guilty of organising a conspiracy for a "palace coup." And this, incidentally, proves the incorrectness of all those passages in the speech for the prosecution made by Citizen the State Prosecutor, where he makes out that I adopted the pose of a pure theoretician, the pose of a philosopher, and so on. These are profoundly practical matters. I said, and I now repeat, that I was a leader and not a cog in the counter-revolutionary affairs. It follows from this, as will be clear to everybody, that there were many specific things which I could not have known, and which I actually did not know, but that this does not relieve me of responsibility.

I admit that I am responsible, both politically and legally, for the defeatist orientation, for it did dominate in the "bloc of Rights and Trotskyites," although I affirm :—

- (a) That personally I did not hold this position ;
- (b) That the phrase about opening the front was not uttered by me, but was an echo of my conversation with Tomsky.
- (c) That if Rykov heard this phrase for the first time from me, then, I repeat, it was an echo of my conversation with Tomsky.

But I consider myself responsible for a grave and monstrous crime against the Socialist fatherland and the whole international proletariat. I further consider myself responsible, both politically and legally, for wrecking activities, although I personally do not remember having given directions about wrecking activities. I did not talk about this. I once spoke positively on this subject to Grinko. Even in my testimony I mentioned that I had once told Radek that I considered this method of struggle as not very expedient. Yet Citizen the State Prosecutor makes me out to be a leader of the wrecking activities.

Citizen the Procurator explained in the speech for the prosecution that the members of a gang of brigands might commit robberies in different places, but that they would, nevertheless, be responsible for each other. That is true, but in order to be a gang the members of the gang of brigands must know each other, and be in more or



less close contact with each other. Yet I first learnt the name of Sharangovich from the Indictment, and I first saw him here in Court. It was here that I first learnt about the existence of Maximov, I have never been acquainted with Pletnev, I have never been acquainted with Kazakov, I have never spoken about counter-revolutionary matters with Rakovsky, I have never spoken on this subject with Rosenholtz, I have never spoken about it to Zelensky, I have never in my life spoken to Bulanov, and so on. Incidentally, even the Procurator did not ask me a single question about these people.

The "bloc of Rights and Trotskyites" is first and foremost a bloc of Rights and Trotskyites. How then, generally, could it include Levin, for example, who stated here in court that to this day he does not know what a Menshevik is? How could it include Pletnev, Kazakov and others?

Consequently, the accused in this dock are not a group. They are confederates in a conspiracy along various lines, but they are not a group in the strict and legal sense of the word. All the accused were connected in one way or another with the "bloc of Rights and Trotskyites," some of them were also connected with intelligence services, but that is all. This, however, provides no grounds for asserting that this group is the "bloc of Rights and Trotskyites."

Secondly, the "bloc of Rights and Trotskyites," which actually did exist, and which was smashed by the organs of the People's Commissariat of Internal Affairs, arose historically. It did really exist until it was smashed by the organs of the People's Commissariat of Internal Affairs. It arose historically. I have testified that I first spoke to Kamenev as far back as 1928, during the Sixth Congress of the Comintern, which I at that time directed.

How, then, can it be asserted that the bloc was organised on the instructions of Fascist intelligence services? Why, this was in 1928! By the way, at that time I narrowly missed death at the hands of an agent of the Polish "Defensiva," a fact very well known to everybody who stood close to the Party leadership.

Thirdly, I categorically deny that I was connected with foreign intelligence services, that they were my masters and that I acted in accordance with their wishes.

Citizen the Procurator asserts that I was one of the major organisers of espionage, on a par with Rykov. What are the proofs? The testimony of Sharangovich, of whose existence I had not even heard until I read the indictment.

The record of Sharangovich's testimony was submitted to me,

from which it appears that I practically drew up the plan for wrecking.

*Sharangovich* : Stop lying, for once in your life at least. You are lying even now in Court.

*The President* : Accused Sharangovich, don't interrupt.

*Sharangovich* : I could not restrain myself.

*Bukharin* : Take Ivanov. Generally, what I have to say about his testimony is the following. Certain persons, who were connected with the Okhrana in the past, testified that from fear of exposure they decided to wage a struggle against the Soviet power, and that they therefore joined the Rights, the underground organisation, which orientated itself on terrorism. But where is the logic? Fine logic, indeed. From fear of possible exposure they joined a terrorist organisation, where they ran the risk of being caught the very next day. This is hard to imagine; I at least cannot imagine it. But Citizen the Procurator believed them, although all of it sounds very unconvincing.

Khodzhayev asserts that I advised him to get in contact with the British resident agent, while Ikramov says that I told him that Turkestan was a choice morsel for England. In reality, this is far from the truth. I told Khodzhayev that advantage should be taken of the antagonisms between the Imperialist powers, and in a vague form I supported the idea of the independence of Turkestan. Not a single word was said about any resident agents. Citizen the State Prosecutor asked : But did you see Khodzhayev? I did. Was this in Tashkent? It was in Tashkent. Did you talk to him about politics? About politics. That means that you spoke about the resident agent. Such conclusions were drawn several times, and when I protested against them, Citizen the Procurator accused me of not telling the truth, of trying to wriggle out of it, of wishing to conceal the truth, and so on; and in this he was supported by a number of my fellow-accused. But it seems to me that in this case real logic is wholly on my side. Citizen the State Prosecutor declared on the basis of these materials that all the espionage connections proceeded through the channels of Rykov and Bukharin. Yet Citizen the Procurator said that every word was important here. The speech of Citizen the Procurator contained references to two Japanese newspapers. But why does it follow that these reports refer precisely to me and the Rights?

I, however, admit that I am guilty of the dastardly plan of the dismemberment of the USSR, for Trotsky was negotiating about

territorial concessions, and I was in a bloc with the Trotskyites. This is a fact, and I admit it.

I categorically deny my complicity in the assassination of Kirov, Menzhinsky, Kuibyshev, Gorky and Maxim Peshkov. According to Yagoda's testimony, Kirov was assassinated in accordance with a decision of the " bloc of Rights and Trotskyites." I knew nothing about it. But what Citizen the Procurator calls logic comes here to the aid of the factual content. He asked whether Bukharin and Rykov could have stood aside from these assassinations; and he answered that they could not have stood aside because they knew about them. But not standing aside and knowing are one and the same thing. This is what in elementary logic is called tautology, that is, the acceptance of what is yet to be proved as already proven. But what is the real explanation? It might be said: Well, then, you villain, how do you explain these facts? Can you deny that some decision was adopted by some section or other with the knowledge of Yenukidze and Yagoda, or you deny even that? I cannot deny it, Citizens Judges. But if I cannot deny it, and at the same time cannot affirm it, I can make a certain conjecture. After all, you must bear in mind the secrecy of the work. The centre did not hold meetings: matters were discussed as occasion arose, and given such secret methods of communication and connections with each other, such things are quite possible.

As to Maxim Peshkov. Yagoda himself says that this assassination concerns him personally. I have no right to intrude into this sphere. But this is Yagoda's statement, fortified by so fundamental a fact as his request to have the matter heard in camera, a fairly weighty consideration. Yet Kryuchkov says that it was done in order to lower Maxim Gorky's buoyant life tonus. And, if I am not mistaken, one of the Counsel for Defence also adopted this viewpoint. But this can be seen through. This argument is countered by so weighty a fact as Yagoda's personal statement, which is corroborated by the fact that this point was referred to the session in camera.

As to Menzhinsky. Bulanov testified to personal motives here too. Menzhinsky was already ill, he could not have injured the " bloc of Rights and Trotskyites " in any way.

Why, then, can this be regarded as likely?

I will dwell on Bulanov's testimony.

The most painful and most horrible thing is the death of Alexey Maximovich [Gorky]. What testimony did I give, how did I give it, and under what circumstances? I was asked (apparently

the investigation had already furnished material on the subject) whether I did not recall anything that could throw light on the hostile attitude of the Right and Trotskyite parts of the bloc towards Gorky. I recalled the conversation with Tomsy which I mentioned here in Court, and about which the Procurator interrogated me. The substance of this conversation was that Tomsy cursorily remarked that the Trotskyites were preparing to commit hostile acts against the Stalinist, Gorky. It absolutely did not occur to me at the time that he could refer to a terrorist act. I turned a deaf ear to it. During the interrogation I recalled this conversation with Tomsy. To the insistent demands of Citizen the Procurator I steadily replied that the thought of a terrorist act had not occurred to me at the time. Here in Court, in reply to one of the questions of Citizen the Procurator, I said: "But now I see that it was to this he was referring." Citizen the Procurator drew the following conclusion from this; he said: "What is this, if not a veiled admission?" A veiled admission of what? What is admitted? The fact that I had learnt in Court a number of new facts which had not been known to me, and that therefore the conversation I had had with Tomsy might retrospectively be regarded in an entirely different perspective. I consider that the argumentation of Citizen the State Prosecutor in this case cannot be regarded as adequate.

Take the year 1918. Citizen the Procurator declares that in 1924 I was compelled to make a confession regarding such and such a conversation in the Smolny. I was not compelled; I experienced absolutely no pressure on me to do so; nobody but myself even hinted at it, and I published this example in order at that time, 1923-24, to show the utter harm of the factional struggle, and what it was leading to. So that first of all I would like to clear up this misunderstanding.

Citizen the State Prosecutor said that Bukharin cited nothing in refutation of the evidence of the five witnesses, who stood here in this Court before us all, before Citizens the Judges of this case who asserted that I had the design, the thought, the idea which I insistently advocated, of arresting Lenin and physically destroying him, and, moreover, to Lenin were added two other prominent figures in the Party—Stalin and Sverdlov. But it is not true that I cited no arguments in refutation. Citizen the Procurator may consider them untrue, feeble, unconvincing, but it cannot be said that I cited nothing in refutation. I cited a number of arguments.

The chief witness was Varvara Nikolayevna Yakovleva. Varvara Nikolayevna Yakovleva dates this whole incident about the pre-

parations for the conspiracy with the "Left" Socialist-Revolutionaries against Lenin, Stalin and Sverdlov, for their arrest and supposed murder, etc.—she dates all this in her evidence, and then at the confrontation and during the trial—to the period prior to the Peace of Brest-Litovsk. I said at the confrontation, at the preliminary investigation, and in Court, that it is not true. It is not true that before the Brest-Litovsk Peace the "Left Communists" and the Trotskyites wanted to effect a coup d'état by forcible means; it is untrue because the Trotskyites and the so-called "Lefts" had the majority in the Central Committee, and if the Trotskyites had not capitulated at the decisive moment when the vote on the question of the Brest-Litovsk Peace was taken, the Trotskyites and the "Lefts" would have had the majority in the Central Committee. That being the case, how can it be supposed that they then capitulated in order to resort to conspiratorial methods? Everybody who lived through that period remembers perfectly well that the feelings of the "Left Communists" at that time, before the Brest-Litovsk Peace, were such that they hoped to win a Party majority at the next Party Congress. That being the case, how could there have been any talk about that of which the witness Varvara Nikolayevna Yakovleva now speaks? But I cited another example. Varvara Nikolayevna Yakovleva asserted that the Moscow Regional Bureau was the factional centre of the "Left Communists." I then took the liberty of mentioning several names, several respected members of the Party. I only wanted in this way to discredit the argument of Varvara Nikolayevna Yakovleva. It is well known that a number of prominent people—Kuibyshev, Emelyan Yaroslavsky, Menzhinsky and others—were at that time supporters of the "Left Communists," belonged to my "Left" group. The relative importance of these people was far greater than that of the Mantsevs, Stukovs and the rest; and by political temperament and political activity they were more efficient than the persons mentioned. And so until the Brest-Litovsk Peace the central group in Leningrad comprised the persons mentioned. And so I ask, how could there have been a plan of revolt if these people held the key position in the central group? It is inconceivable, it is impossible. And here Varvara Nikolayevna Yakovleva, the principal witness against me, is mixing things up with an entirely different period following the Brest-Litovsk Peace, the Moscow period.

I beg your forgiveness, Citizens Judges, for fixing your attention on this point: but as it is a very grave matter and a very interesting

one, and as so much attention was devoted to it in the Court, I took the liberty of repeating what I have already said. Yet Citizen the State Prosecutor asserted that I cited nothing to exonerate myself on this point.

I will not dwell on other things, because I do not want to take up your time. I admit that there was one conversation with Karelin and Kamkov, and the initiative with regard to the arrest of Lenin for twenty-four hours, and the subsequent bloc with the "Left" Socialist-Revolutionaries proceeded from the "Left" Socialist-Revolutionaries. But in the first conversation the reply was negative in a rude form. And as regards the fact that negotiations were subsequently conducted through Pyatakov with the "Left" Socialist-Revolutionaries—and this may be considered, as Citizen the Procurator, if I am not mistaken, formulated it, as an attempt to overthrow the Soviet power by forcible means—this, I admit; it was the case. As to the plan of physical extermination, I categorically deny it, and here the logic to which Citizen the State Prosecutor referred, namely, that forcible arrest implied physical extermination, will not help in the least. The Constituent Assembly was arrested, but nobody suffered physically. We arrested the faction of the "Left" Socialist-Revolutionaries, yet not a single man of them suffered physically. The "Left" Socialist-Revolutionaries arrested Dzerzhinsky, yet he did not suffer physically. And I say—and this was omitted from the speech of the State Prosecutor—that in these criminal and dastardly conversations, it was specifically stipulated that not one hair of the persons concerned should be injured. You may think what you like but it is a real fact.

This episode after the Brest-Litovsk Peace, generally took up an extremely short space of time, because very soon afterwards the "Left" Socialist-Revolutionaries began to act. We had to arrest the faction of "Left" Socialist-Revolutionaries. I myself took part in this operation, I myself took part in directing the arrest of the faction of "Left" Socialist-Revolutionaries. After this we had nothing more to do with the "Left" Socialist Revolutionaries generally. I went abroad on revolutionary work, then returned, then, I repeat, I was wounded by a "Left" Socialist-Revolutionary bomb. I do not deny that it was not thrown at me personally, as the witness Mantsev stated, but I want to say that everybody knew that I was to deliver a lecture in the building of the Moscow Committee, and it was at this moment that the attempt was made, and I was slightly wounded. A number of leading figures in the

Party were killed. As is known this attempt was made by the bloc of the "Left" Socialist-Revolutionaries, headed by Cherepanov and his wife, Tamara, with the so-called underground anarchists.

I mentioned Mantsev because Cherepanov was arrested by the "Left Communist" Mantsev, as he was not an ally of Cherepanov. It is not true that Bela Kun encouraged the "Left" Socialist-Revolutionaries

I want to say that there was one brief period of criminal conspiracy between the "Left Communists" and the "Left" Socialist-Revolutionaries which quickly collapsed after their action, in the suppression of which a number of "Left Communists" took an active part.

To support his speech the State Prosecutor advanced a number of other points which were to provide a base for a period, a black period, in my life.

There are a number of mistakes here. First of all, I was never an Otzovist, although the State Prosecutor says I was.

The State Prosecutor accuses me of the fact that I worked with Trotsky as an editor of the magazine *Novy Mir*, and that I had a bloc with Trotsky. I object to this.

The State Prosecutor accuses me of having opposed Comrade Stalin in 1924. I do not remember any such case. I now conclude my objections to certain charges which the State Prosecutor brought against me in the course of the trial, and I will return to the crimes I actually did commit. I have already enumerated them twice. The gravity of these crimes is immense. I think it is unnecessary to repeat how grave these crimes are; it is clear enough as it is.

I only want to say that the Trotskyite section on more than one occasion acted separately, and it is possible that individual members of the bloc, like Yagoda, may also have acted separately, because Yagoda, as Bulanov testifies, regarded Rykov and myself as his secretaries, and he himself in this Court has called me a chatter-box who organised idiotic mass uprisings when it was a question of a *coup d'état*. But I am connected with the "bloc of Rights and Trotskyites," and it is quite natural that I politically answer absolutely for everything.

The extreme gravity of the crime is obvious, the political responsibility immense, the legal responsibility such that it will justify the severest sentence. The severest sentence would be justified, because a man deserves to be shot ten times over for such crimes. This I admit quite categorically and without any hesitation at all.

I want briefly to explain the facts regarding my criminal activities and my repentance of my misdeeds.

I already said, when giving my main testimony during the trial, that it was not the naked logic of the struggle that drove us, the counter-revolutionary conspirators, into this stinking underground life, which has been exposed at this trial in all its starkness. This naked logic of the struggle was accompanied by a degeneration of ideas, a degeneration of psychology, a degeneration of ourselves, a degeneration of people. There are well-known historical examples of such degeneration. One need only mention Briand, Mussolini and others. And we, too, degenerated, and this brought us into a camp which in its views and features was very much akin to a kulak prætorian fascism. As this process advanced all the time very rapidly under the conditions of a developing class struggle, this struggle, its speed, its existence, acted as the accelerator, as the catalytic agent of the process which was expressed in the acceleration of the process of degeneration.

But this process of degeneration of people, including myself, took place in absolutely different conditions from those in which the process of degeneration of the international labour leaders in Western Europe took place. It took place amidst colossal socialist construction, with its immense scope, tasks, victories, difficulties, heroism . . .

And on this basis it seems to me probable that every one of us sitting here in the dock suffered from a peculiar duality of mind, an incomplete faith in his counter-revolutionary cause. I will not say that the consciousness of this was absent, but it was incomplete. Hence a certain semi-paralysis of the will, a retardation of reflexes. It seems to me that we are to a certain extent people with retarded reflexes. And this was due not to the absence of consistent thought, but to the objective grandeur of socialist construction. The contradiction that arose between the acceleration of our degeneration and these retarded reflexes expressed the position of a counter-revolutionary, or a developing counter-revolutionary, under the conditions of developing socialist construction. A dual psychology arose. Each one of us can discern this in his own soul, although I . will not engage in a far-reaching psychological analysis.

Even I was sometimes carried away by the eulogies I wrote of socialist construction, although on the morrow I repudiated this by practical actions of a criminal character. There arose what in Hegel's philosophy is called a most unhappy mind. This unhappy



mind differed from the ordinary unhappy mind only by the fact that it was also a criminal mind.

The might of the proletarian state found its expression not only in the fact that it smashed the counter-revolutionary bands, but also in the fact that it disintegrated its enemies from within, that it disorganised the will of its enemies. Nowhere else is this the case, not can it be in any capitalist country.

It seems to me that when some of the West European and American intellectuals begin to entertain doubts and vacillations in connection with the trials taking place in the USSR, this is primarily due to the fact that these people do not understand the radical distinction, namely, that in our country the antagonist, the enemy, has at the same time a divided, a dual mind. And I think that this is the first thing to be understood.

I take the liberty of dwelling on these questions because I had considerable contacts with these upper intellectuals abroad, especially among scientists, and I must explain to them what every Young Pioneer in the Soviet Union knows.

Repentance is often attributed to diverse and absolutely absurd things like Thibetan powders and the like. I must say of myself that in prison, where I was confined for over a year, I worked, studied and retained my clarity of mind. This will serve to refute by facts all fables and absurd counter-revolutionary tales.

Hypnotism is suggested. But I conducted my own defence in Court from the legal standpoint too, orientated myself on the spot, argued with the State Prosecutor; and anybody, even a man who has little experience in this branch of medicine, must admit that hypnotism of this kind is altogether impossible.

This repentance is often attributed to the Dostoyevsky mind, to the specific properties of the soul ("l'âme slave" as it is called), and this can be said of types like Alyosha Karamazov, the heroes of the *Idiot* and other Dostoyevsky characters, who are prepared to stand up in the public square, and cry: "Beat me, Orthodox Christians, I am a villain!"

But that is not the case here at all. "L'âme slave" and the psychology of Dostoyevsky characters are a thing of the remote past in our country, the pluperfect tense. Such types do not exist in our country, or exist perhaps only on the outskirts of small provincial towns, if they do even there. On the contrary, such a psychology is to be found in Western Europe.

I shall now speak of myself, of the reasons for my repentance. Of course, it must be admitted that incriminating evidence plays

a very important part. For three months I refused to say anything. Then I began to testify. Why? Because while in prison I made a revaluation of my entire past. For when you ask yourself "If you must die, what are you dying for?"—an absolute black vacuity suddenly rises before you with startling vividness. There was nothing to die for, if one wanted to die unrepented. And, on the contrary, everything positive that glistens in the Soviet Union acquires new dimensions in a man's mind. This in the end disarmed me completely and led me to bend my knees before the Party and the country. And when you ask yourself: "Very well, suppose you do not die, suppose by some miracle you remain alive, again what for? Isolated from everybody, an enemy of the people in an inhuman position, completely isolated from everything that constitutes the essence of life. . . ." And at once the same reply arises. And at such moments, Citizens Judges, everything personal, all the personal incrustation, all the rancour, pride, and a number of other things, fall away, disappear. And, in addition, when the reverberations of the broad international struggle reach your ear, all this in its entirety does its work and the result is the complete internal moral victory of the USSR over its kneeling opponents. I happened by chance to get Feuchtwanger's book from the prison library. There he refers to the trials of the Trotskyites. It produced a profound impression on me; but I must say that Feuchtwanger did not get at the core of the matter. He stopped half way, not everything was clear to him; when, as a matter of fact, everything is clear. World history is a world court of judgment. A number of groups of Trotskyite leaders went bankrupt and have been cast into the pit. That is true. But you cannot do what Feuchtwanger does in relation to Trotsky in particular, when he places him on the same plane as Stalin. Here his arguments are absolutely false. For in reality the whole country stands behind Stalin; he is the hope of the world; he is the creator. Napoleon once said that fate is politics. The fate of Trotsky is counter-revolutionary politics.

I am about to finish. I am perhaps speaking for the last time of my life.

I am explaining how I came to realise the necessity of capitulating to the investigating authorities and to you, Citizens Judges. We came out against the joy of the new life with the most criminal methods of struggle. I refute the accusation of having plotted against the life of Vladimir Ilyich, but my counter-revolutionary confederates, and I at their head, endeavoured to murder Lenin's

cause, which is being carried on with such tremendous success by Stalin. The logic of this struggle led us step by step into the blackest quagmire. And it has once more been proved that departure from the position of Bolshevism means siding with political counter-revolutionary banditry. Counter-revolutionary banditry has now been smashed, we have been smashed, and we repent our frightful crimes.

The point, of course, is not this repentance, or my personal repentance in particular. The Court can pass its verdict without it. The confession of the accused is not essential. The confession of the accused is a medieval principle of jurisprudence. But here we also have the internal demolition of the forces of counter-revolution. And one must be a Trotsky not to lay down one's arms.

I feel it my duty to say here that in the parallelogram of forces which went to make up the counter-revolutionary tactics, Trotsky was the principal motive force. And the most acute methods—terrorism, espionage, the dismemberment of the USSR, and wrecking—proceeded primarily from this source.

I may *infer a priori* that Trotsky and my other allies in crime, as well as the Second International, all the more since I discussed this with Nikolayevsky, will endeavour to defend us, especially, and particularly myself. I reject this defence because I am kneeling before the country, before the Party, before the whole people. The monstrosity of my crimes is immeasurable, especially in the new stage of the struggle of the USSR. May this trial be the last severe lesson, and may the great might of the USSR become clear to all. Let it be clear to all that the counter-revolutionary thesis of the national limitedness of the USSR has remained suspended in the air like a wretched rag. Everybody perceives the wise leadership of the country that is ensured by Stalin.

It is in the consciousness of this that I await the verdict. What matters is not the personal feelings of a repentant enemy, but the flourishing progress of the USSR and its international importance.

## SOVIET EDUCATION

### Its Phases and Purpose.

SOVIET education in retrospect presents a bewildering picture at first glance. It has run through the whole gamut of educational theory and practice. It has changed with a rapidity disconcerting alike to foreign students and to Soviet teachers, so that the student may be forgiven if he doubts at times the unity of Soviet educational aims. None the less a careful study reveals a fundamental unity of aim. However varied and changing may be the practice at different periods, the principles always remain constant. Nor were the changes the mere whims of inexperienced theorists.

If there is one conclusion above all others to which one is forced by a study of Soviet education, it is that political economic conditions are the circumstances which decide the educational system of a country. Seen in the light of these conditions, the Soviet education of the twenty years of its existence ceases to be a jumble of experiments. It becomes instead a reasoned, consistent policy, consciously pursued for the attainment of Bolshevist aims.

Let us for a moment examine the conditions on the arrival to power of the Bolshevik Party. Even before the Great War Russia was culturally and economically one of the most backward countries. The promise of the Empress Catherine's educational efforts was never fulfilled, so that though Russia was one of the first countries to have a state system of education, it was of the Great Powers the one with the highest percentage of illiteracy. The Tsars quickly realised that an educated people was a menace to autocracy and despotism and the attempts of one to spread education were quickly nullified by another. For example, Alexander I attempted to create an educational ladder up which a percentage, very small indeed, of the children of the people might climb from the parochial schools to the university. Nicholas I issued legislation which forbade secondary education to serfs, workers and peasants.

In different reigns various Ministers of the Tsars publicly expressed their hostility to education for the people. A typical example was the Minister for Instruction, Shishkov, in the reign of Tsar Alexander. "To teach the mass of the people or even the majority of them how to read will bring more harm than good."

Schools and Universities existed for the sons and daughters of the ruling class and of the well-to-do. The very able literary and scientific work that was carried on in the universities had little influence on the whole community. One side of the educational picture showed great scholars, scientists and artists; the other 72 per cent. illiteracy for the whole empire and up to 99·7 for some

of the Asiatic provinces. One side showed a picture which included all branches of learning; the other showed the time-table for primary schools planned as this one—

Religion	..	..	..	6	hours	a	week
Church Slavonic	..	..	..	3	..	..	
Russian	..	..	..	8	..	..	
Writing	..	..	..	2	..	..	
Arithmetic	..	..	..	5	..	..	

Three hours a week in addition are assigned to Church singing.<sup>1</sup>

There were, in 1914, 7,800,000 children at school between the ages of 8 and 14. The number of children at school or any educational establishment under 8 was negligible. Except for some private kindergartens and a few organised by philanthropic and public-spirited women, schools for those under 8 years were non-existent. In the same way, adult education was limited to that carried on by revolutionary workers and to the efforts of a few public-spirited Russians.

Had the Bolsheviks come to power constitutionally under normal conditions, their educational task would have been heavy enough. The events following 1914 aggravated the difficulties to a colossal degree and created complications, the results of which it has taken three years to overcome.

The war very soon showed the backwardness of Russian industrial and economic life. The demands made by the war resulted in a dislocation of industry, and very soon in that disintegration of the country which was completed by the civil war and intervention. Quite apart therefore from the entirely new factor of communism, which would inevitably condition education along certain lines, there were the material factors, for which the Communists had no responsibility which gave a certain pattern to education in the early years of the revolution. These were the serious lack of schools and equipment and the more serious lack of teachers of any kind. The shortage of teachers in general was nothing compared to the shortage of experienced, educated teachers of any political opinions and to the greater shortage still of experienced communist teachers. The teacher problem was heightened by the refusal of considerable numbers to work under the Soviets.

It was with a full realisation of all the difficulties that the Bolsheviks set about the realisation of their educational purpose, the creation of a communist citizen, who in turn would help to create a communist society. There is much more comprehended

<sup>1</sup> Education in Russia, Board of Education Special Reports, 1909.

in this aim than appears obvious at first glance. Its scope may be realised from a quotation from a speech by Lenin to a conference of the Komsomol. "We cannot limit ourselves to communist conclusions and learn only communist slogans. You will not build up Socialism like that. You will be communist only when you have enriched your minds with the knowledge of all that humanity has created. . . . If I know that I know a little, I will endeavour to know more. But when anyone says he is a communist and so does not need a solid foundation of knowledge, he is not, and never will be anything approaching a communist."

Lunacharsky, the first commissary for education expressed not so differently the Communist ideas of education: "The finest conquest of Communism will be a renaissance of art and of the sciences—this is the most sublime objective of human evolution. Marx told us that the only goal worthy of humanity is the greatest possible enlargement of all human faculties." These were ultimate aims, to have their effect on education in a greater measure as the material conditions of socialism were realised.

There were however urgent, immediate needs after the revolution which shaped education in its early stages. The first was the creation of a sufficient body of communist support to carry the Government through the first difficult and precarious years.

The other equally urgent, need was the training of an industrial army. The support of the people for the Bolshevik régime depended on whether it could give them better conditions than those under which they had lived before. Better conditions meant first of all more food, then more clothing and finally better housing. To achieve this it was necessary to create entirely new industries, both heavy and light. The rest of the world hoped that by refusing help, that is credit, with which the Soviets could buy goods, the Bolshevik régime would collapse. The government was therefore forced to develop its own resources with the very inadequate means at hand. It meant in practice that a predominantly peasant population of extreme backwardness had in the space of a few years to be trained to run factories, utilising highly skilled processes, that it had to be accustomed and trained to using highly scientific methods of work and of organisation in agriculture, that it had, in a word, to be taught how to work.

The educational system had to take on responsibility for this task of creating quickly a communist youth and a nation skilled in industry and agriculture.

*Organisation and Method.*

One of the first acts of the Soviet government was to make education free for the workers. This was followed in June 1918 by the separation of the Church from the State and the secularisation of education. The State took over the education system; but because of the material difficulties, a certain number of private schools were allowed on the condition that by 1927 they were all handed over. The children of the former bourgeoisie were only admitted to the State schools when there was room, and they had to pay for their education.

Each republic had from the beginning its own commissariat of education. At this stage the system for the Union was not highly centralised. Ukraine for example differed in certain aspects from the RSFSR.

The first education decree ordered the organisation of kindergartens for the children of pre-school age; and for the first time in the history of Russia these young children attended educational institutions in any number.

The organisation of the school system was very simple. All class distinctions in schools were abolished. The school to which all children might go became known as the Unified Labour School. This name signified much. It emphasised the fact that the State was now a workers' State, and that labour was the axis round which life rotated: labour including the work of hand and brain. It was to be a seven year school, later to be developed into a nine or ten years school. It was divided into two grades (stepeni) the first from 8 to 12 years, the second from 12 to 15 years. The immediate task was to create sufficient schools of the first grade. Many of the seven year schools were given a definite factory bias, and these were known as Factory Seven Years Schools, or in brief "FZS". There were many boys and girls too old to enter the Unified Labour school who yet had to be trained for industry and given some general education. This need resulted in the creation of the Factory Apprentice School—*Fabrichno-Zavodskoe Uchenichestvo* or FZU. Pupils entered at 15, and spent half the time in general education and half in training for industry. At first they could enter these even when illiterate; then two years schooling was demanded. The qualification increased with the increase of schools, until finally entrance to the FZU was conditional on having finished the Seven-Year School.

The demand for skilled workers created a new type of educational unit, that of the Worker's Faculty or *Rabochy Facultet*

generally known as Rabfacs. These were four year courses of study designed to prepare factory workers for entrance to the university. The students attended these courses, either wholly in the evening or partly in the evening and partly in working hours, being paid for the time absent from work. At first these too accepted illiterates. Gradually the qualifications were raised until finally completion of the Seven-Year School was demanded.

The organisation, like all other aspects of education, has undergone change. As the class which did not labour disappeared, so the emphasis on the word "labour" in the schools diminished. The term "Unified Labour School" appears to have fallen into disuse by 1928 or so and given place simply to the *Semiletka* and, where it existed or was expected to exist, to the *Desyatiletka*. Today the schools are known according to the duration of the period of education. The primary school—four years—is the *Nachalnaya Shkola*; the seven year school is the incomplete secondary school or *Nepolnaya Srednaya Shkola*; and the ten-year school, which the Soviet authorities expect to be general by 1940, is the secondary or *Srednaya Shkola*. The pre-school education is carried on in what is best described in English as nursery-infants-schools, known in the USSR as *Detskije Sady*. It is noteworthy that all qualifying appellations have been dropped. A school is now merely a school. With the evolution of the classless society the need for emphasising the Soviet school as a "workers' " school has disappeared.

It is however within the school and the university itself, in method and content, that there has been the greatest and most significant development.

The period immediately after the revolution was pregnant with educational theories. On one thing only were the different theorists agreed, that the pre-war curriculum and methods must be abolished. There were many views expressed with much emphasis, as to what was to replace the old education. There was the not inconsiderable group headed by Shulgin, who considered that school was unnecessary altogether. Shulgin enunciated the theory that "the street teaches, the factory teaches, and the party teaches; therefore school was redundant."

. Another group insisted that it was detrimental to the well-being of the State that children should live with and be brought up by their parents. All children belonged to the State, and should therefore be brought up in State institutions. Several attempts were made to set up children's homes. Neither of these groups had much influence on Soviet education. The supporters of the "State up-



the VIII Komsomol Conference in 1928 emphasised the need for scientific knowledge "There stands before us a citadel. The name of this citadel is science and its innumerable branches of knowledge. We must capture this citadel at all costs . . . To become masters of science, to forge new centres of Bolshevik specialists in all branches of knowledge, to study, study and study with the utmost persistence, that is our problem today." Long before Stalin, Lenin had insisted on the same point, particularly emphasising all science affecting electricity. Over and over again he stated that electrification plus collectivisation would bring socialism.

Here we have the two basic needs of the country, socialist citizens and skilled workers. Here was the task of the school. How was it to be achieved? Obviously the educational methods used in the Tsarist schools would not serve a socialist purpose. The school must be a place of freedom, the school must be a place where the children were to rule, and the school must be a place of experiment. Soviet educationists scoured the world for methods and organisation. They found that progressive people abroad had organised schools where formal teaching had disappeared, where complete self-government had taken the place of the old discipline from above, and these schools appeared to be successful.

The latest progressive ideas were adopted universally. Book learning disappeared, and education became learning by doing. There were very few text books and hardly any reference books, and teacher and pupil had together to find the information by doing.<sup>3</sup> The problems which the new society threw up, were new problems, the answers to which could very often not be found in existing books of reference. Soviet educationists had to create new knowledge.

The Complex method was adopted universally, after the first three or four years of search and experiment. A Complex is a theme consisting of several projects. For example, a survey of a village is a complex, and so is its water supply; the occupation of the inhabitants, its food supply, are all projects. The selected complex was divided into projects among the class, a group of children taking over a project. As there were no books, information had to be obtained at the source. The group would set forth to the object of its study and collect all the information it could. Every adult worker had to be prepared to supply information.

<sup>3</sup> For a detailed description of early methods and syllabus see Scott Nearing's *Soviet Education*, 1926.

Often there was considerable interference with work in a factory or a railway station.

Having collected the information, the children would return to school and would desire to make a record of the knowledge obtained. This brought home to them the necessity of learning to write. Similarly, the desire for knowledge only to be obtained from books brought home to them the necessity of reading. It was held that by this means children would learn to read and write without effort and well.

The Complex method was dropped after a year or two; and the Project method remained in use for all primary schools up to 1931.

The discipline in the school in the early days was as free as the methods of learning. In fact the schools were run by the pupils, as the universities were by the students. But it was not only the belief in the value of self-government which made the Soviets give so much power to pupils and students. It was also the fact that many teachers and professors remaining at their posts were anti-communists. While some strove honourably to do their work as teachers, many others used the opportunity for anti-Soviet propaganda. Early self-government was therefore used as a means of watching the teachers and professors. It became a common practice for adverse reports to be sent in by pupils and students on their teachers and professors, as a result of which they were dismissed. Further to ensure that the teaching should be communist, every school had, besides a Head, a Director. The Head was a teacher, and was responsible for the study. The Director was a communist and might have been anything by profession, a cook, a tailor, a joiner. He or she was responsible for the Communist direction of education. As the number of communist-trained teachers and Heads increased, so the need for the political supervision disappeared. In 1934 a decree, dealing with the staffing of schools, made it clear that the dual responsibility had been abolished. There was one Head of a school, to be called a Head in the primary school and a Director in the secondary school.

#### *Discipline and Self-Government*<sup>4</sup>

The new society required a new type of discipline in the schools. That was obvious. Lenin, addressing the Third Conference of Komsomols, said "In place of the old military discipline, which

<sup>4</sup> *Changing Man—The Soviet Education System*, by Beatrice King (Victor Gollancz, 1936), Chap. VII.

existed in the bourgeois society in spite of the will of the majority, we are going to create an intelligent worker and peasant discipline." Discipline became a politically significant subject. "The fight for a conscious discipline has a political meaning."<sup>5</sup>

Under these circumstances the teachers, so many of whom were opposed to the Soviet régime, could not be entrusted with the responsibility for discipline. In the early years this responsibility had to be handed over to the pupils. And indeed it was so. The whole organisation of school life was given over to the pupils. In some cases they decided the time-table and syllabus. When a visitor arrived at the school, it was a pupil who met him, conducted him over the school and answered all questions. There were innumerable committees with innumerable meetings. There were committees for order and cleanliness, committees for work and play. Never was there a time when so much freedom was so general.

Freedom however is only one side of the coin of life. The other side is responsibility. Children can only mint coins of small denominations, lacking the raw material of experience. When they attempt to produce coins of larger denominations, these ring false. To leave the metaphor, it became obvious as time went on that children could not satisfactorily use completely unfettered freedom; that because they lacked experience they were not capable of forming judgments or of giving decisions on any and every situation. The journal of pedagogy in 1928 criticised severely the demands that were made on the capacity for judgment of quite small children. It criticised severely the practice of letting children judge and punish the misdemeanours of their class-mates. The best educationists realised the limitations of freedom, but they accepted the conditions in the school as a temporary stage, until improved social and economical conditions gave better teachers. They were bending circumstances to fulfil the immediate aim in order to achieve the ultimate purpose.

The year 1928 saw the launching of the First Five Year plan, a plan which made great demands on the school, a plan which needed disciplined and organised workers. The effect of this was soon made obvious in the school. Extreme freedom was to be replaced by organisation. "To be organised," became the watchword. Work was carried on in an organised way, play was organised, leisure was organised. The children now had to enter school in twos. During break all the play activities were organised and were carried on collectively. There were

<sup>5</sup> *Pistrak, Na Shkolnye Temy*, p. 96.

organised activities after school hours and there were organised activities on the weekly holidays. Very little opportunity was given to the child to be alone or to do nothing. This state persisted throughout the education system. It was found in the nursery-infant schools, where the whole of life was shaped to produce an organised collective-minded being. Some earlier instructions in this respect had stated that, if a teacher saw a small child playing by itself in the playground, she was to take and lead it gently back to its group. In the universities life was similarly organised. No one was alone. It was the inevitable reaction from the earlier freedom, and the reaction to the economic demands of the country.

By 1932, the first Five Year Plan was fulfilled. This had an important effect on the organisation and discipline as well as methods of teaching in schools. The country had now created the heavy industries which would enable it to create the light industries for producing consumption goods. Education could now pay regard to academic standards, to leisure occupations. A commission had been inquiring into the state of education. The decrees issued in 1932<sup>6</sup> stabilised the changes that had been taking place for some time in education—changes which arose in response to the development of society.

The urgent demands of society for trained workers, coupled with the inexperience of the teachers, proved the project method to be unsatisfactory. It was found that the pupils had obtained a superficial knowledge of many subjects, but no thorough grounding in the basic subjects, without which a satisfactory education cannot be built up. Reading, writing and calculating, the foundation of a civilised life, were very unsatisfactory indeed. Pupils entered technicums and institutes quite unprepared for the serious work demanded.

The Dalton Plan, which had been used in a slightly modified form—work was done in brigades of three or four—had served its purpose in the early stage, but was becoming unsatisfactory for the same reasons, the need to train workers speedily, and the inexperience of the teachers. The decree finally abolished both the Project Method and the Dalton Plan as methods of teaching. It restored the class lesson, as the pivot round which teaching was to centre. Work in brigades was abolished and individual work with books was introduced. Great stress was laid on the need for pupils to learn the art of using books. Visits to museums, excursions, charts, illustrations—everything possible was to be used to make

<sup>6</sup> See *Pravda*, July 1932, *Izvestia*, September 1932.

learning interesting, but the teacher was once again an important factor in learning.

The organisation of the school was placed completely in the hands of the Director and the staff or the Head and staff. Self-government was limited to the sphere of the children's competence. A later decree abolished class committees in classes 1 and 2. Once again it was emphasised that self-government in the USSR was not a means of making the teacher's job easier but a method of training in responsibility, a method of developing initiative and organising ability. These objects could only be achieved if the tasks set to the pupils were within their range, if the judgment they were called upon to exercise could draw upon their experience. There are committees in all forms above 1 and 2, and they deal with orderliness, with the organisation of out of school activities. All children are concerned to raise the standard of work, and much of their activity is centred round this concern.

The same year, 1932, saw the decree which drastically changed life in the universities and institutes of higher education. In the universities there had, if possible, been even more freedom than in the schools. Even the hours of work were often decided by the students. In the beginning lectures had been almost completely abolished. Work was done in brigades by five or six students. All work was collective. There was no individual responsibility for work. A thesis would be the result of the collective effort of the brigade. In the universities, as in the schools, these methods served their purpose until the government was assured of communist support from the professors and lecturers. The fulfilment of the first Five Year Plan coincided with a change in the attitude of the old professors and with the arrival on the scene of communist-trained professors. The academic standard, which had been lowered by the admission of students without any form of examination, had not fully recovered. Yet the advance in industry and agriculture was demanding better qualified workers. The main purpose of the decree of 1932 dealing with higher education was to raise the standard of work.

The organisation of the university or institute was placed in the hands of the director and staff. The students retained control over their life outside academic hours. There is no interference from the authorities in their social life. But they are expected to work and to attend lectures.

The brigade-laboratory method has been abolished, and individual work with individual responsibility introduced. The lecture by the

professor has been restored. Practical work, connected with the theoretical work in which the student is engaged, forms 30 to 40 per cent. of the course of the last three years. The course for any profession is still a five-year course. Students are to be reprimanded for being late at lectures, and persistent lateness or absence leads to expulsion, with exclusion from a higher education institute for five years. ✓

#### *Out of School Activity.*

The aim of the school is to train communist citizens. A communist citizen must take an active share in the social economic and political life of the community. The school must therefore give this training very early. Children must be encouraged to take an interest in the life outside the school. This was no mere pious expression. The backward condition of the country made serious demands on the children. The needs of the country demanded that the adults, as well as the children, must be educated quickly. As there were not enough adult cultural workers the children were pressed into the service. Their achievements are amazing. *Litso Novoy Shkoly*, (Moscow 1929), is a collection of reports on this and other activities of the schools, and makes astonishing reading. The elimination of illiteracy in its first stages owes much of its success to the zeal and enthusiasm of the school children. They organised classes for illiterates, visited the homes of workers and peasants to make registers. There was a shortage of textbooks, exercise books and pencils. They made cut-out alphabets, organised concerts with the proceeds of which they bought pencils and paper. So that these classes might be attended by mothers with children, they organised playrooms for the children and themselves looked after them.

They took upon themselves the solution of the problem of drunkenness. In and out of season, with demonstration, with posters, with banners, with meetings, they waged war against drink. They carried on a similar campaign against dirt and disease. They worked hard to make the adults politically conscious, to make them take part in elections. They achieved great things, but they paid the price in health. This was realised by both the commissariats of Health and Education, and in 1932 a decree was issued, signed by the Commissary of each of these ministries, drastically cutting down the time which school-children might give to these social activities. At the same time, a drive was made to increase facilities for leisure pursuits and hobbies. As the number of adult cultural workers increases and conditions improve, so the social demands

on the children decrease, but a minimum much greater than in other countries will always remain.

*Polytechnisation.*<sup>7</sup>

"Education means to us these things : (1) intellectual development ; (2) physical development ; (3) polytechnical education ; which will give knowledge relating to the general scientific principles of all production processes, and will at the same time give children and youths practice in the use of elementary tools of all branches of production."—Marx.

Polytechnisation is so fundamental a principle of communist education that one could not imagine the Soviet system without it. It had figured considerably in Lenin's writings and speeches on education. Engels had insisted on its importance to communist education. Briefly, it means giving pupils an understanding of the scientific processes underlying production, and of the organisation of production ; a knowledge of the use of all simple tools ; relating practical work to the classroom theory and a close linking up of the school with a productive unit. The launching of the First Five Year Plan made polytechnisation an important issue. Obviously it would help to train skilled workers. Up till then, there was very little done about it in the schools. The Komsomol began a campaign for a polytechnised school. They were ably aided by Krupskaya, Lenin's widow. The result of their activity was the creation of the Institute of Polytechnisation in 1931, the linking up of every school with factory, farm or other enterprise, and the organisation of workshops in the schools for the practical work. By 1934 most schools had excellently equipped workshops, and polytechnisation was a very successful branch of general education.

In 1937 Polytechnisation was abolished. The unthinkable had happened. Consideration of the change and discussion with Soviet educationists make it more intelligible. The work that was being done in the workshops was primitive handwork, even where machines were being used, whereas industry was demanding more and highly skilled and complicated processes. It demanded the application of the latest scientific discoveries, while the schools were teaching methods in use thirty years ago. The practical work in the workshop had of course great educational value through the making of objects. This was recognised ; but it was urged that the time at school was needed to give the children the knowledge of science demanded by the economic and industrial development of the country. Hand-

<sup>7</sup> *Changing Man—The Soviet Education System*, Chap. V.

work as such could be carried on in clubs, in school circles and in Technical Stations (clubs). And so the principle which we had all considered permanent, has given way to the demands of the community.

*Pedology*—the study and measurement of child development was for many years an important branch of Soviet education. In the period between 1926 and 1932 the pedologue reigned almost supreme in the school. Every school of any pretensions had a pedologue. It was obviously impossible for such a vast army of pedologues to be well trained and experienced, and yet they had great power within the school. They planned lessons, they organised school life, they decided which was a difficult child and required a special school. Because of their lack of adequate training and experience, the pedologues lost sight of the communist purpose of education. They elaborated an artificial technique and language, a pseudo-science, so claimed the Soviet authorities, which was in complete divergence with Soviet aims. In 1932 I heard the first rumblings of the storm, which did not break over the heads of the pedologues till 1936. During the whole of this period observation of their work was being carried on, as well as investigation of the results. When it was found that the number of children sent to special schools was increasing alarmingly, that among those difficult children were many clever and gifted ones, it was considered that the time had arrived to call a halt to the activities of the pedologue.

In the usual Russian way the extreme measure was adopted. In July 1936 *Pedology* was abolished lock, stock and barrel. Zalkind and Blonsky, its two great exponents, are in disfavour. This drastic treatment meant the temporary loss of much valuable work that been done both by Zalkind and Blonsky. On the whole however, it means a gain to education. The artificial division between instruction and upbringing has been abolished. Education is once more the all-inclusive sphere that it was originally. Pedagogy has been widened to include psychology and, with it, has broadened the work of the teacher. The teacher's duty is not limited merely to teaching. He must study the individual child and take responsibility for its training.

There are other developments in education equally significant. One of these is the change of emphasis from the collective to the individual. I remember in 1932, when discussing with Krupskaya the effect on the individual of the insistence on the collective and the community, how she was very emphatic that what Communists desired were highly developed individuals; that the State



consisted of individuals. The change in the approach to the child has been remarkable. Time and time again, even in 1936 when I asked how this or that problem was dealt with, I was answered, "It depends entirely on the individual pupil." Spending much time in schools of various ages and types, I could not but be struck by the amount of attention and care that was given to the individual pupil.

With this insistence on the rights of the individual, the over-organisation is disappearing. The director of a school in Moscow, suspecting that life was perhaps over-organised, set a question to her pupils, asking what they would like to do on their free day. One replied "I would like to sit by the window and be bored." This was a signal to which she, like many others, has responded. There are many schools where there is no organised play in the break. In the Kiev Children's Theatre the young folk come as individuals and book their seats, not in organised parties from schools.

Perhaps the most significant change is that in the political propaganda in education. I have notice its diminution year by year. There is today no need to over-emphasise the communist content of Soviet life. The generation now at school knows no other life. Even the severest critic will grant the Soviets great industrial and social achievements, great improvement in the life of the country. Therefore there is no need to over-emphasise the superiority of communism in the USSR, nor is there any need now to distort history or to give other wrong information. This is illustrated by the report on the competition for a history textbook, which gives the findings of the commission appointed to judge the text-books.

In 1934 an important decree was passed on the teaching of history and geography, criticising very severely the unscientific approach to these subjects, their vagueness, their abstractness and the habit of teachers and text books to expatiate on abstract sociological theory. As a result of this decree, new history text books were ordered. A competition for a history text book for classes 3 and 4 was organised. The commission's report criticises severely the superficiality of many of the books submitted. Others are criticised for the lack of understanding of historical events and for minimising their importance while tending to glorify all that happened after the Soviet revolution. Very severe criticism is levelled at authors who "idealise pre-Christian paganism and do not understand the simple fact that the introduction of Christianity was progress in comparison with pagan barbarism, that with Christianity the Slavs received a written language and some features of the higher Byzantine culture. They ignore the progressive rule

of the monasteries in the first centuries after the Christianising of Russia, as centres of literary and colonising bases."

There is no doubt that education is becoming what we in England call liberal in the best sense of the word. That does not mean it is ceasing to be communist; but the early crude features are fast disappearing. Today the business of the pupil is to learn, and a high academic standard is demanded. With it all, there is no sign anywhere of coercion, of forcing the children to learn or to work. The present methods, though to the casual observer they may appear to be the old conventional teaching method, are nothing of the kind. They succeed in inspiring in the children a great love and eagerness for study. The discipline one meets in the school is a natural spontaneous discipline, found because their environment gives to the children integrated personalities, gives them balance and poise. There is no satisfaction in "being naughty" while there is every satisfaction in "being good."

Soviet education is a much truer measuring rod of the progress of the country than the periodic political upheavals. Judged by their work of education, the Soviets hold out much hope for humanity.

BEATRICE KING.

#### BIBLIOGRAPHY

*Bulletin XII*: Adult Education in Russia. The World Association of Adult Education, May 1922.

*Changing Man*: The Soviet Education System by Beatrice King. Victor Gollancz, 1936.

*Civic Training in Soviet Russia* by S. Harper. The University of Chicago Press, 1929.

*The New Education in the Soviet Republic* by A. Pinkevich, 1929.

*Education in Soviet Russia* by Scott Nearing. The Plebs League, 1926.

*History of Russian Educational Policy* by Nicholas Hans. P. S. King and Sons, 1931.

*Schools, Teachers, and Scholars in Soviet Russia*. Williams & Norgate, 1929.

*Bulletin-Komitet po Vyshey Tekhnicheskoy Shkole pri Tsik, USSR*. 1932-37.

*Bulletin Narodnogo Kommissariata po Prosveshcheniyu*. RSFSR.

*Litso Novoy Shkoly*, Moscow 1929.

*Na Shkolnye Temy*. M. Pistrak, 1933.

*Za Politeknicheskuyu Shkolu*. Moscow and Leningrad, 1931.

*Programmy Nachalnoy Shkoly*. 1934, 1936.

*S'yezd po Politeknicheskomy Obrazovaniyu*. Gosizdat, 1931.

# SOVIET HISTORY

## III

*Are there any "objective laws" applicable by the historian?*

There is no dispute among Marxist historians as to the general view that a given social-economic formation develops according to certain, immanent laws which are peculiar to itself. Marx and Lenin thundered against the so-called "eternal laws" of bourgeois political economy, and always insisted that each epoch of historical development had corresponding laws and that no generalisations taken from capitalistic economy could be applied to non-capitalistic relations. Yet the warning has needed to be repeated to some Soviet writers, who hastily attempted to use one *passé-partout* for unlocking the secrets of differing periods.<sup>36</sup> Each historical epoch is completely individual; there cannot be historical "stencils" applicable to all times and peoples.<sup>37</sup> But though each epoch has laws particular to itself and must be studied in concrete detail, it does not follow that there may not be some laws which are valid for several different epochs, or even for all human history. Thus, it has been argued that there are three categories of laws:

- (i) those applicable to one, single, social-economic formation;
- (ii) those applicable to several, but not to all formations, e.g. the laws of the class struggle, of its influence on social development, which clearly cannot be valid for pre-class, or no-class, society;
- (iii) those applicable to all known forms of human society, e.g. the law of the influence of forces of production on relations of production, the basis-superstructure law.<sup>38</sup>

I am not competent to judge as to how far this view would find general acceptance in the USSR, but in any case it does not in any way militate against the necessity for concrete, factual study of the past.

Apparent general agreement among Soviet historians as to the existence of laws of development in history has not, however, prevented in practice the question of "objective laws" and of "objectivity" in history proving a dangerous stumbling-block. This is particularly evident in the campaign against Pokrovsky. Starting by emphasising that there are no "eternal laws" in history, just as there are none in physics, Pokrovsky came, according to one of his critics, to stand for the denial of history as a science

<sup>36</sup> e.g. *Istoriĭ Marksist*, 1933, no. XXXI, p. 70.

<sup>37</sup> Pokrovsky, *Istoricheskaya nauka i borba klassov*, vol. II, p. 383.

<sup>38</sup> V. N. Maksimovsky in "Diskussiya o marksistkom ponimanii sotsiologii," in *Istoriĭ Marksist*, 1929, no. XII, p. 192.

which establishes objective truth and for the insistence on the party nature of history, as above all bound up with immediate political tasks; ultimately his idea of the unity of theory and practice for historians was that they should deal only with subjects directly linked with the present day; the study of more or less remote periods was branded by him as "academism."<sup>39</sup> Another of Pokrovsky's critics similarly denounces him for the watchword "history is politics directed to the past": to present an historical past in the colouring of present-day political interests reduces Marxist history to the level of bourgeois subjectivism; if the political interests of the 20th century proletariat be applied as the criterion to every past epoch, we are reduced to regarding all previous history either as preparatory stages for our contemporary activity or as a long series of actions delaying or militating against it. In either case any possibility of a true understanding of history is denied; historical personages are artificially divorced from the social environment in which they lived and worked, and are converted into imaginary beings decked out with aims and tasks which, in fact, never belonged to or confronted them. Actually the generations of the past had before them the aims and tasks of their times which they sought to decide, some men playing a progressive role, others a conservative and reactionary role; but Pokrovsky's standpoint means judging them simply and solely from the standpoint of the interests of the present day proletariat.<sup>40</sup>

And, further, Pokrovsky's denial of any objectivity in history or science, in which he was largely influenced by Bogdanov's views, involved him in the doctrine of a proletarian science and history and culture which should take nothing from the bourgeois; each class made its own science or history, which was true from the point of view of the class whose interests it reflected; each ideology, every historical construction was simply the reflection of class understanding "in a distorting mirror."<sup>41</sup> Hence Pokrovsky was

<sup>39</sup> P. Drozdov, in *Istoriia Marksizma*, 1936, no. LIII, pp. 18-20. At any rate in his last years Pokrovsky tried to guard himself against such an accusation, e.g. *Istoricheskaya nauka i borba klassov*, vol. II, pp. 392-3.

<sup>40</sup> F. Gorokhov, *Lenin i istoricheskii materializm* (Moscow, 2nd enlarged ed., 1937), pp. 58-61.

<sup>41</sup> A. Shcheglov, in *Pod znamenem markizma*, 1936, no. V, pp. 65-7. Shcheglov admits (p. 69) that Pokrovsky after 1918 freed himself to a large extent from the baneful influence of Bogdanov, but he could not rewrite all his writings or destroy their effect. It is also admitted, by Drozdov, *loc. cit.*, p. 13, that Pokrovsky performed great services through his exposure of the class roots of bourgeois historians and of their views on Russian historical development. This was done especially in his lectures in 1923 *Borba klassov*

*Continued on next page*

attacked as having never understood the Leninist view that bourgeois history is one thing when written at a time when the bourgeois represented progress (e.g. particularly in France in the late 18th and early 19th centuries), and another thing when written at a time when the bourgeois represented collapse and reaction.<sup>42</sup> This Leninist recognition of some merits in some non-Marxist history is not admitted, however, to involve the toleration of subjectivism or relativism in history, as not only Pokrovsky has found (posthumously) to his cost. T. Friedland, a prominent professor in Moscow and a specialist on the French Revolution and international relations since 1870, recently committed himself to the statement: "Class society sets certain inevitable limits to the possibility of historical knowledge." From that flows the conclusion that there can be no "truly scientific, objective history" even when written by the proletarian class.<sup>43</sup> This year Friedland has duly fallen into disgrace.

The "correct" view is that historical materialism includes an element of relativism without being reduced to it. This is in accordance with Lenin's treatment of the theory of knowledge, and with his insistence that historical materialism has never claimed to explain everything in history, but only to show the sole scientific manner whereby history may be explained. If it is still objected that Soviet historians write class history, history from the standpoint of the proletariat as a "class for itself," and that therefore they can achieve relative truth only, the most recent answers are as follows. Historical materialism does not draw a dividing line between class consciousness, or the party standpoint, and objectivity; on the contrary, it is only possible to reflect correctly the objective laws of social development through the proletarian, party, point of view, because the objective course of historical development works in the interests of the working class, and hence only the proletariat is concerned to reflect the development of objective

*2 russkaya istoricheskaya literatura*, reprinted in his *Istoricheskaya nauka i borba klassov*, vol. I, pp. 7-132. There is no English translation, but a very brief version of it appears as an appendix to the English translation of *Brief History of Russia*, vol. I, pp. 236-51. A. I. Tyumenev's article on bourgeois historical science in the West in *Marxism and Modern Thought* (London, 1935), pp. 235-319, is a good adaptation of Pokrovsky's methods

<sup>42</sup> Shcheglov, *loc. cit.*, p. 67.

<sup>43</sup> *Istoriia Marksizma*, 1937, vol. LX, p. 32, and pp. 143-59, for a detailed criticism of Friedland's offending article on Boulangerism and Russian diplomacy. The main count against "this Trotskyist terrorist" seems to have been that he deliberately falsified Bismarck's policy in regard to Franco-Russian relations in such a way as to justify Nazi attacks on the 1935 Franco-Russian alliance.

reality as fully and as correctly as possible.<sup>44</sup> "The objectivity of the theory of Marx and Lenin is organically linked with the fact that it shows the sole possible and necessary path of development of society—the path of fundamental, revolutionary transformation of the bourgeois structure of society."<sup>45</sup>

## IV

*What is the role of the individual in history?* The prominence in the preceding sections of social-economic formations and the laws that govern them may give the impression that Marxist history allows no place for the personality of individuals and their influence in history. No such impression would be gained by anyone who studied the lives of Marx or Engels or Lenin, whatever the impression made by some theoretical expositions of historical materialism. It is true that historical materialism is particularly concerned with those results of men's actions which are different from what men intended or willed or imagined, but at the same time, as has been emphasised at the beginning of this paper, ostensibly Marxist historians in the USSR have been severely taken to task precisely on the ground that they have misunderstood the relations of freedom and necessity, have ignored the role of personality, and have reduced historical materialism to a series of ready-made labels about the automatic development of productive forces.

This was one of the principal counts against Pokrovsky. His basic error was declared to be economic materialism, the view that societies develop automatically, in accordance with "elemental" economic currents, without relation to the wills of individuals: this view results in travestying the real importance of the class struggle and in entirely omitting living human beings "who by their struggles influence the course of social life." Further, economic materialism tries to deduce the ideological superstructure directly from its economic basis without allowing for the dialectical relation between basis and superstructure, for all the complex and contradictory process of their mutual interaction. "Historical materialism regards economics as only in *the final instance* the determining basis of all social development, and it emphasises the active role

<sup>44</sup> Shcheglov in *Pod znamenem marksizma*, 1936, no. V, pp. 68-9; cf. A. Tyumenev, in *Istorič Marksist*, 1929, no. XII, pp. 161-4. Shcheglov adds that the bourgeois while they were playing a progressive role were capable to a certain extent, though never so thoroughly, of doing likewise, of discovering objective truth

<sup>45</sup> F. Gorokhov, *Lenin i istoričesky materializm*, p. 58.

of the whole totality of the other social aspects of human activity."<sup>46</sup> This is denied by economic materialism. Thus, Pokrovsky was accused of reducing exceedingly complicated phenomena and processes to explanation in terms of one single economic fact; e.g. the social struggles of Ivan the Terrible's times and the binding down of the peasantry were reduced to the substitution of the three-field system for the previously prevailing form of extensive agriculture; Tsarist foreign policy and the social-political life of 19th century Russia was reduced to corn exports and corn prices on the London market. Living people become nothing but economic manikins; classes with their concrete interests and active share in social life become empty categories.<sup>47</sup>

It is clear that no mercy can be given to economic materialism if it implies the unimportance of political struggles, of party organisation and party leadership. It is impossible to insist on the absolute necessity for a strong party organisation without recognising at all the subjective factors in history. It is impossible to fill the USSR with busts of Lenin and Stalin without allowing some place for the role of leadership and personality. Hence the claims of contemporary and recent history have immensely strengthened the drive against any form of economic materialism involving views as to the "elemental," automatic nature of historical occurrences. The two essentials for the Leninist-Stalinist historian are declared to be the understanding of the revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat, and emphasis on the action of the masses and their historical initiative (especially "on the struggle of the toiling masses of backward peoples oppressed in the past by imperialism").<sup>48</sup> An article with the title "*The role of personality in history*," published two years ago in one of the chief Marxist reviews, brings out clearly some of the issues in question.<sup>49</sup>

Stalin has emphatically declared that Marxism does not at all deny the role of gifted personalities; on the contrary, it recognises

<sup>46</sup> Gorokhov, *op. cit.*, p. 62 (italics Gorokhov's)

<sup>47</sup> Drozdov in *Istorič Marksist*, 1936, no. LIII, pp. 14-17; and cf. Shcheglov, *loc. cit.*, pp. 64-5. The influence of Bogdanov and Rozhkov on Pokrovsky's historical views is specially emphasised. Pokrovsky avowed (1928) his early economic materialism, pointing out that it was called so partly owing to the pre-revolutionary censorship, but he maintained that, unlike Rozhkov, he had entirely outgrown it and had, at least since 1925, combated it: *Istoričeskaya nauka i borba klassov*, vol. II, pp. 267-71.

<sup>48</sup> A. Lomakin, in *Istorič Marksist*, 1934, no. XXXV, pp. 14, 16.

<sup>49</sup> M. Kammari, in *Pod znamenem marksizma*, 1935, no. I, pp. 31-50. The following paragraph is a summary of the article. Kammari develops the same general line in a second article, *ib.*, 1937, no. III, on personality under the conditions of capitalism and of socialism.

their role as important; but "great men" achieve what they do, only so far as they correctly understand the conditions within which they work, understand how to change them, and succeed in keeping continuous contact with the masses. The task of historical materialism is to explain the actions not only of particular individuals but of masses and of classes. The subjective factor in history is the consciousness, will, and degree of organisation of the masses or classes, in a time of revolution it is these same characteristics coupled with the decisiveness of the masses in going into the fight and with the degree of organisation and preparedness of the class-conscious advance-guard in the leadership of the masses. When the objective conditions for the decision of a historical task are prepared,<sup>50</sup> then the subjective factor is the deciding issue; and the subjective factor may fail; as Stalin says, classes, parties and their leaders can make mistakes, and fail to utilise all the conditions for converting historical possibilities into actuality. The part played by personality in history, if viewed in its proper connection with general processes, is not a matter of chance. Those (e.g. Plekhanov) who tend to make of leaders merely the conscious expressers of the unconscious, elemental course of development in history, are utterly wrong. A leader of the proletariat not only expresses the historical tasks of the proletariat at a given time; as well he organises and directs its struggle, guides by action the movement of his class. Revolutionary experience shows that without capable leadership the greatest heroism of the masses can be defeated by their enemies. The question of the subjective factor and of personality in history differs according to what historical epoch is being considered. The main emphasis is laid upon Marxist, proletarian leadership: Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin are great leaders because they understand the laws of historical development and revolution and apply them consciously in action. Communism means the fullest possible growth of personality; in the USSR, and there alone, all the objective conditions and possibilities of such growth are now present; therefore the subjective factor becomes decisive; and Stalin is quoted to the effect that now that the role of objective conditions is reduced to a minimum in the USSR nine-tenths of the responsibility for mistakes and failures must fall on the individual.

If we turn back from the present and recent history behind the

<sup>50</sup> Kammarî remarks (p. 41) that people themselves create and prepare the objective conditions for the realisation of their tasks and aims. He does not amplify this statement.



advent of Marxism, the position is somewhat changed. The subjective factor in history is less important,<sup>51</sup> but still it is of consequence, and particularly for what constitute at various periods the progressive classes of a society. "Great men" have played a part in history, and historians and teachers must explain concretely and precisely, for instance, in what ways Peter I (he ought not to be styled Peter the Great) was the "Tsar-reformer," in what ways he used his abilities and energy to further progress in Russia, even though the cost to the vast bulk of his subjects was appalling.<sup>52</sup>

There is a noticeable revival of Peter (even apart from the cinema), and the revolts in his reign no longer monopolise attention. I do not mean to suggest that peasant risings and the oppression of the peasantry and non-Russian subject peoples at all periods are not still one of the main themes in Soviet history, but more allowance is beginning to be made than previously for other aspects in Russian history. It is noticeable that the text-book of one prominent Soviet historian (N. N. Vanag) has been criticised for its abstract, schematic conclusion that peasant wars in the epoch of feudalism were inevitably destined to failure and defeat; complaint is made that feudal times are reduced to a perpetual refrain, "the power of the feudal landowners grew stronger and stronger, the exploitation of the peasants worse and worse." It is pointed out that, although full victory for the peasantry was possible only in a later epoch under the leadership of the proletariat, yet a measure of success under the given conditions of feudalism was possible if the peasantry allied itself with the revolutionary town bourgeoisie, and that such success was attained, e.g. in Tuscany, Switzerland and France at the end of the 18th century.<sup>53</sup> It is pointed out, in

<sup>51</sup> It is declared by Kammari (*loc. cit.*, p. 37) to be of very limited importance for the proletariat since it was too subjected to the grinding round of material production. He goes on to say "It is impossible to forget that hitherto the great masses have been called to active historical emergence and creativeness only in periods of risings, wars, and revolutions," and that prior to October 1917 these were of very brief duration in the whole scale of history.

<sup>52</sup> There has not yet been much Soviet historical work on Peter I's reign; and the bulk of it has been devoted either to industrial and mining developments or to the revolts of Bulavin, at Astrakhan, and among the Bashkirs. It is perhaps symptomatic that this year there has appeared a volume of documents on Peter's reign, designed primarily for training colleges and seminars, which emphasises other aspects, the preface takes the same line on Peter as that outlined above in the text; V. I. Lebedev, *Reformy Petra I*. So, too, S. Tomsinsky's article on "The importance of the reforms of Peter I.," in *Istoriĭ Marksist*, 1936, no. LIV, pp. 9-21.

<sup>53</sup> *Istoriĭ Marksist*, 1933, no. XXXII, p. 108 Vanag has fallen into disgrace this year.

regard to Russian history, that it is erroneous merely to emphasise the oppression of the peasantry without at the same time showing that the role of the Muscovite Grand Princes from Ivan Kalita (1330c) onwards was a relatively progressive one and that the creation of a more or less centralised state in the 16th century was a big step forward: it is erroneous to refer to Minin and Pozharsky merely as representatives of the landowners and merchants heading counter-revolution and suppressing peasant rebellions, and to dress up the two "false Dimitris" as very important figures, almost as revolutionaries and leaders of the peasantry; they ought to be shown as really only adventurers who tried to turn the peasant risings to their own personal advantage and that of the Polish *szlachta*, and Minin and Pozharsky should figure as heading the movement which freed Russia from Polish intervention.<sup>54</sup>

These points are duly incorporated in Shestakov's new text-book (see above, note 6). They illustrate the tendency to emphasise the relatively progressive part played by feudal or bourgeois individuals and institutions. As a final example of this may be given the treatment in Shestakov of the introduction of Christianity into Russia at the end of the 10th century. This is indeed represented as a measure taken by the Varangian princes to strengthen their power, and in despite of popular risings against the new religion: nevertheless, "Christianity at the time was in comparison with paganism a step forward in the development of Russia," for it meant the introduction of a higher culture, Byzantine culture.<sup>55</sup> This is not allowed in the case of the Mongol conquest: the *pax mongolica* and its cultural and political advantages for the Russian petty principalities of the 13th and 14th centuries, which have been so belauded by the Eurasian school of (*émigrés*) historians, are stoutly denied by Shestakov. The Mongol yoke was a yoke, cruel and oppressive, and the main fact picked out is Ivan the Great's ending of it in 1480.

Shestakov's text-book illustrates two further features in the teaching and study of history in the USSR, which I should like to emphasise in concluding this paper—the multi-national and the patriotic keynotes. From the very first the reaction against the pre-revolutionary, Great Russian treatment of Russian history was predominant, and it went to very dangerous lengths in the Ukraine. Tsardom had always been denounced as "the prison house of

<sup>54</sup> P. Drozdov in *Istorič Marksist*, 1936, no. LIII, p. 12.

<sup>55</sup> The same general line is taken in S. Bakhrushin's learned article on the conversion of Kievan Russia in *Istorič Marksist*, 1937, no. LX, pp. 40-77.

peoples"; now that they were free, they were to write their own history. Within the last ten years it has been repeatedly laid down that Russian history means the history of the peoples of the USSR: that is indeed its official name. Parallel with the industrial shift eastwards, parallel with the development of Arctic aviation and Asiatic exploration, there has developed a greatly increased interest in the history of the non-Russian peoples, a development which has taken the form both of cheap outline histories of this or that people or region (in non-Russian languages as well as in Russian), and of learned publications and collections of documents. The outline books do not seem usually to be by any means up to the required standard of Marxist history. The scholarly works are for the most part confined to the last two or three centuries.<sup>56</sup> This, in many cases, is almost inevitable in view of the absence or paucity of written evidence for earlier periods, though notable exceptions are provided by the Georgians and Armenians and in the case of the Mongols. As would be expected, the great bulk of this "eastern" history is concerned with the struggles of the non-Russian peoples against Russian conquest and oppression. These struggles are strongly emphasised in Shestakov's text-book, and the general importance attached to the multi-national character of the Union is reflected at the very beginning in the mention of the first states that arose within the territory of the USSR about three thousand years ago in Trans-Caucasia (Urartu), and somewhat later in Central Asia. As *Pravda* did not fail to point out, Georgia, at any rate in the shape of the forbears of the Georgians, figures from the very first.

The patriotic keynote in the most recent Soviet history is little less prominent. There is a marked tendency here for the specifically Russian element to be elevated above the non-Russian in writing of the past of Russia. Defence of the Soviet homeland, of the conquests of the October revolution, is of course part and parcel of the Soviet régime. In the last few years it has frequently been pointed out that the word *rodina* has come into general use in the USSR as a patriotic term. Shestakov opens with a brief introduction headed "*Nasha Rodina*," "Our Homeland," in which the *leit-motif* of his text-book is set out: "from a backward country our homeland has become the most advanced and powerful," thanks

<sup>56</sup> Reference should especially be made to the *Institut Vostokovedeniya*, which since 1932 has published six volumes of *Zapiski*, twenty volumes of *Trudy*, and ten numbers of the *Bibliografiya vostoka*. Another important series is that of *Materialy po istorii narodov S.S.S.R.*, published by the Academy of Sciences in the collection *Trudy Istoriko-Arkheograficheskogo Instituta*.

to the Bolshevik party's leadership of the workers and the peasantry. But in the past of "our homeland" brave deeds also were done in defence of it, particularly, as the press summaries emphasise, against the Germans and the Poles. Full quotation is given of the passage describing Alexander Nevsky's dramatic victory in 1242 over the "pseudo-knights" of the Teutonic Order. "The struggle was very severe; the ice was red with blood . . . the Germans did not withstand the attack of the brave warriors of Novgorod and fled. Alexander Nevsky pursued the enemy right up to the frontier of his lands. Thus did the men of Novgorod decisively beat the enemy and preserve their land from the violations of the Germans." The Polish attempts at the opening of the 17th century to set Ladislas on the Muscovite throne are treated somewhat similarly: in the end the efforts of the old enemies of the Russian State, the Polish nobility, failed before the popular movement for national independence, headed by Minin and Pozharsky. Forty years later, the Polish oppressors of Ukraine suffered further defeat at the hands of the peasants and Cossacks, led by Bogdan Khmelnytsky, and Ukraine was joined to Muscovy. This event (like the later acquisition of Georgia and Kazakstan) is represented as the lesser of three evils: it was a question of subjection either to the Poles or to the Turks or to the Russians (either to the Persians or to the Turks or to the Russians; either to the Chinese, the Khivans or to the Russians): relatively, acquisition by Russia meant progress. In more than one sense the USSR is the heir of the Russian Empire; no opening must be given for the inculcation of false Ukrainian or Georgian or Kazak nationalism at the expense of Soviet patriotism and "our homeland."

The materials which I have used for this paper consist mainly of articles and books by Soviet teachers or historians and of party resolutions. I should like to close with a quotation from an entirely different kind of source which bears directly on the new Russian patriotism. "Balticus" in the current number of *Foreign Affairs* records a conversation which he had with one of the new Soviet élite, a man of 30 or 35, a German-trained engineer, the son of an artisan. He is represented as saying: "You cannot imagine all the harm which the Trotskyites have caused. When the Master (Stalin) surveyed the field of public education, what did he find? The Trotskyites held all the teaching posts and had suppressed the teaching of history. Our children were no longer going to know the great past of Russia. How were the Trotsky-inspired histories interpreting the past? Peter the Great was a drunkard, Catherine

the Great a tart. True, Catherine had her paramours, but she continued Peter's work of making Russia great. The Trotskyites told the youth nothing of the Russian poet, Pushkin. If they had had their way, they would have suppressed the theatre and the ballet, of which Russians ought to be proud. . . . In a word, everything Russian was suspect. But Russia is still alive.<sup>57</sup> "

B. H. SUMNER.

*Balliol College,  
Oxford.*

*September-October, 1937.*

NOTE — Since writing the above article, the Shestakov text-book, to which I have made frequent reference, has been published. The press summaries of it used by me give a fair résumé, but I should like to guard against any impression that I may have conveyed that it is not mainly the story of brutal oppression culminating in the liberation of the October revolution and the achievements of the last twenty years.

<sup>57</sup> *Foreign Affairs* (New York), October, 1937, p. 61.

## GABRIEL BETHLEN

### TRANSYLVANIA IN THE XVIIth CENTURY

"GENTLE READER"—wrote Mr. Nathaniel Butter's *Weekly News* (London) in January 1623—"By this time I am sure you are possest with the severall rumors of divers remarkable things, which Europe exposeth unto you." Among the political news, the actions of Gabriel Bethlen, Prince of Transylvania, were a constant feature. On 28 October, 1623, a special edition came out, "A Most True Relation, contayning the great Invasion made by Bethlen Gabor in the Emperors Dominions." "It is knowne almost to the universall world"—wrote the editor—"what great successes the house of Austria hath had within these few yeares to the terrour of the Turke himselfe . . . but is now become a defendant against the incursions made by the Turke and Bethlen Gabor." In the reports of European journalism now entering on the first period of its existence the Prince of Transylvania made his appearance, among the famous personages of his time. He was the indefatigable Eastern opponent of the Central European Habsburg Power. Contemporary public opinion in England had a fairly clear idea of his position in the continental political system. He stood on the Protestant side in the Thirty Years' War and was supposed to be an ally of the Sultan. The *Weekly News* complaining of the persecution of the Protestants in Austria, added to the information with confidence: "But once againe comfort appeares . . . the approach of Bethlen Gabor fortifies my hopes."

At the beginning of the 17th century continental politics were dominated by the religious question and the secular rivalry of France with the Emperor. The Catholic Empire of the Habsburgs, which included also Bohemia and the western part of Hungary was in conflict with the European Protestant forces. On the other hand, the Catholic king of France, a constant enemy of the German Empire in Central Europe, found natural allies in the German Protestants and, in the East, in the Ottoman Power. In the time of Bethlen, Transylvania was the eastern rampart of this European front which surrounded the Empire. Considering these facts, we must first inquire into the origin of this independent Principality, separated from the original Hungary, though Transylvania had belonged to Hungary from the earliest period as an eastern province under a special administration.

From the end of the 15th century, the incoherent, feudal states of the Middle Ages began to be transformed into absolute—we may

say national—Powers. The monarchs crushed the political influence of the Estates, formed a closed and united country out of the feudal territories, maintained a standing army and tried to introduce a new, central administration. Ferdinand in Spain, Louis, XI in France, Henry VII in England were the first representatives of the new, absolutistic tendency.

In Central Europe, the development was not completely successful. Territorial unity was not achieved either in Germany or in Italy. In Germany, the new tendencies prevailed in isolated territories, and the Emperor enforced his absolute will in his own dominions.

Towards the East we find again various divergent tendencies and different singularities. East Central Europe, a large territory situated between Germany on the one side and Turkey and later Russia on the other, and inhabited by smaller nations, was the scene of unsuccessful attempts to establish absolutism. Under the strong hand of Mathias Corvinus, a true Renaissance king, Hungary rose to be a leading power in this area. Having a solid administration and a standing army at his disposal, her king laid the foundations of Hungarian absolutism. But Mathias alone could not accomplish the work of several generations. He died without a legitimate son and successor. The ensuing weakness and reaction led to a catastrophe due to the fatal situation of the country, crushed on two sides by overwhelming forces, which made this part of Europe, in the course of History, the land of defeated heroism and of tragic efforts. The decisive defeat of Mohács in 1526, which handed to the Grand Turk a large part of the country, was not the opening of the secular struggle. The defence of Hungary and of Christian Europe—Hungary was called "*propugnaculum Christianitatis*"—was successful in the 15th century. In the 16th it was glorious but almost hopeless, and, during the 17th, it exhausted the last reserves of the people. The defensive struggle against the oriental Great Power was the chief problem of Hungarian history during two centuries.

How could Bethlen appear in the eyes of Butter and N. Browne as the ally and friend of the Turks? What could drive this eminent figure of Hungarian history over to the Turkish side? The peculiar position of Hungary at this time explains this seeming contradiction. The defeat forced the Hungarians to apply for help to the West. In the place of the young Louis II, killed on the battlefield, they elected Ferdinand, Archduke of Austria and younger brother of the Emperor Charles V, in the hope that the German Power would then render aid against the Turks. But the country which came

into Ferdinand's possession, was no longer the prosperous and powerful kingdom of Mathias Corvinus. The southern and central parts were occupied by the Turks and, in the East, Transylvania was in the hand of John Zápolya, who had been elected "national king" by Ferdinand's opponents. This double election was the first step towards the historical role played by independent Transylvania. The Sultans, recalling the power of Mathias's Hungary, wanted to prevent forever the restoration of Hungarian unity. Nevertheless, statesmen of both Hungarian parties realised the danger of this policy, and did everything in their power to force a favourable solution. Mutual treaties guaranteed the prerogatives of Ferdinand over Transylvania. No Hungarian of the 16th century could renounce the idea of unity; but practically this idea could have materialised only if the Emperor had had force enough to defend Transylvania against the Turks, who regarded every attempt in this direction as a challenge. In any other case Transylvania, surrounded from three sides by the Turks and connected with Western Hungary only by a small strip of territory, could not defy the overwhelming forces of the marauding Turkish armies.

Though public opinion was unanimously against the eastern enemy, it must be borne in mind that Hungary was divided also by the religious question. Protestantism, almost general in the country at the end of the 16th century, was repressed during the 17th by the counter-reformation in the western territories. The Protestants found a natural ally in the Protestant princes of Transylvania. Henceforth, the political differences between the Habsburgs and Transylvania assumed a religious character—this was of course a general European symptom at this time—and all political treaties included also resolutions referring to the religious problem.

The independence of Transylvania was undoubtedly facilitated by the geographical and strategical situation created by the Turkish conquest. The Hungarian forces were not sufficient to defend the eastern parts against the Sultan in case of aggression. Therefore, the separate existence of Transylvania was looked upon by the Hungarians of the 16th century as a necessary evil. They knew that the extinction of Transylvania would threaten the very existence of Hungary as a whole.

During the 17th century this political conception underwent a gradual change. It was enriched by new theories. The Hungarians who had expected energetic aid from the German Empire, became more and more dissatisfied with the policy of the status quo, pursued by the Habsburgs. It was the French question which distracted the



Emperor's attention from the secondary eastern front. A defensive line was created connecting the more important fortified towns of the West and the North. Buda remained in Turkish hands with the whole centre of the country. With all the disadvantages of a neglected frontier-territory, Hungary had to endure German military and administrative oppression. Disappointment became general in the second half of the 17th century and showed itself in armed risings. Exhausted Hungary was ground between two fires. She never ceased to be anti-Turkish, nevertheless her attempts to throw off foreign oppression gained her a rebellious, pro-Turkish reputation.

It was at the beginning of the 17th century that this political reorientation became first manifest. Stephen Bocskay, a wealthy Protestant nobleman, originally a partisan of the traditional policy based on German aid, was compelled to flee from imperial oppression and persecution, and as leader of a successful campaign against the Emperor, he became Prince of Transylvania. His military and political successes helped him to form a new political conception. In his eyes, the independence of Transylvania was not merely the necessary result of a deplorable political exigency. He regarded the existence of an independent Protestant principality, which would maintain as far as possible equally good relations with West and East, as a useful creation and a necessary good. As representative of the traditional western policy, George Thurzó, the later Palatine, protested against the separation of the eastern territories. But Bocskay evolved from his own successes his new idea: the task of independent Transylvania was to defend Hungary, including her western parts, against foreign oppression. Of course, this rôle was only possible if the principality was safeguarded in the East against the Turk. But this was facilitated by the fact that the separation of Transylvania did not hurt Turkish interests. Since Suleiman the Magnificent, Turkish policy did its best to prevent the re-uniting of the forces of western and eastern Hungary and, as its consequence, a joint attack against the conquered central territory.

Gabriel Bethlen<sup>1</sup> was 26 years old when Bocskay died in 1606. His ancestors were landed noblemen who had been in the service of Princes. He was left an orphan at an early age, and owing to lack of means he had a simple education. He acquired very early political

<sup>1</sup> Bethlen's life and historical work have been the subject of exhaustive researches. The most eminent works about Bethlen are David Angyal's synthetical work in Vol. VI of Szilágyi's *Millennial History of Hungary*—(in 1928 he also published a summary of his researches concerning Bethlen in the *Revue Historique*)—and that of Julius Szekfu, published in 1929. This present summary is based on these recent researches.

impressions exercising a decisive influence on the evolution of his political thoughts. A member of the younger generation, he had seen at the age of fifteen the fall of Prince Sigismund Báthory, the ally of the Emperor, and a victim of his adventure against the Turks. Bethlen saw the ravages of military terrorism under Basta, the imperial commander-in-chief, in Transylvania. In 1602, Basta triumphed over Moses Székely, the leader of an anti-imperialist movement. The young Bethlen, with some other partisans of Székely, was compelled to flee to Turkish territory.

The very idea of taking refuge in Turkey was new and alien to the traditional feelings of the 16th century. Now it was an inevitable step, a sign of the new situation. It was there, in the Sultan's realm, that the young Bethlen became acquainted with the peculiar Turkish conditions. In the eyes of the Hungarians, the Turkish Empire was not only a sworn enemy and constant aggressor, but also the unknown, heathen, oriental Power. They regarded its existence as God's punishment inflicted on a sinful world. Bethlen already had an idea of Turkey, her life and political peculiarities. He knew the hated Unknown. He knew his way in Turkish administration and knew how to treat orientals. His political realism and his talent for diplomatic discussion began to develop. In Bocskay's time Bethlen returned to Transylvania and lived in the prince's service. After Bocskay's death, it was Bethlen, who obtained the Sultan's recognition for the election of the new prince, Gabriel Báthory.

To a large extent, the young prince owed his position to the skill of Bethlen, who supported him at the election and, as adviser, placed his political experience at the prince's disposal. But grave political and personal differences soon arose between them. Báthory, a wealthy, stately, but frivolous young man, was a complete contrast of his reserved, sober, cool-headed adviser. The unruly, dissolute life of the young prince and his thoughtless policy led the country towards anarchy. Violent events and proscription compelled Bethlen again to flee into Turkish territory. In the meantime he wrote to the Palatine Thurzó, representative of the western policy: Transylvania needs a prince, "who lives in peace with the neighbouring countries and governs his land calmly." In 1613, the Turkish Army expelled Báthory. In his place Bethlen became Prince on 23 October.

He had before him the difficult task of consolidating his country. At this time, Transylvania was known as the "Fairy Land," not because her political conditions were wonderfully balanced, but, on the contrary, because they were unsteady and incalculable. A

strong personality like Bocskay could enforce his constructive will, but after him disorder prevailed again : indeed up to this moment Transylvania had really hardly existed as a well-built, independent political factor. The principality was a typical East-Central European territory : several religions and three " nations " (Hungarian, Saxon, Székely) lived together within its boundaries. This " Union " was regulated by laws and privileges. Gabriel Báthory did not realise the fundamental principle that the country was not to be ruled without an inner equilibrium and he showed a violent feeling against the Saxons. Bethlen's first endeavour was to stabilise peace again. " What is the Union ? " he said at the Diet in 1614—" Nothing else, but a holy alliance of the three nations in times of peace and war for the preservation of our Country."

Owing to the geographical situation of Transylvania, it was essential for Bethlen that he should be sure of the benevolence of the Sultan. Who was capable of defending him against the Turkish forces coming from three sides ? If there was no other way, he made some concessions to the Turks or allowed them some prerogatives of which he made a hundredfold use, and thus appeared to the Sultan as his friend. In the West he had to prepare his great plan for the reorganisation of the whole of Hungary. When the Bohemian insurrection broke out in 1619 as the first act of the Thirty Years' War, he found the right moment to begin the realisation of his plans.

The Bohemian movement gained a European significance by the simple fact that a wealthy land of the Habsburg Monarchy turned against the Emperor. But Bohemia had to seek allies. The Bohemian Estates—at this time the political influence of the Estates-General in Bohemia was as great as in Hungary—sought to find support in " confederation " entered into with the Silesian, Austrian and Hungarian Estates. This experiment having ended in failure, Bethlen's alliance was all the more valuable. Indeed, Bethlen's attack against the Emperor in 1619 was partly occasioned by the request of the Bohemians. The crown was also offered to him, although this was only a " diplomatic promise," common at this period, and Frederick of the Palatinate finally succeeded to the throne. It is probable that Bethlen at first relied upon the success of the Bohemians and upon his diplomatic designs in that country. As he put it in his Manifesto, the defence of religion and the liberty of the Nation prompted him to fight. These were no mere temporary causes, but an expression of his permanent opposition to the Habsburg Emperor. The immediate motive must be sought in his own plans, for the question of liberty and religion was at that particular

time not more urgent than at any other moment. But, no doubt, the position of Protestantism in Hungary and the cause of Hungarian independence grew stronger with Bethlen's successes.

Bethlen's attack differed from the Bohemian insurrection in its careful political and military preparation. Concealing his real intentions, Bethlen distracted the Emperor's attention. By winning the sympathies of the people, he won the territories before actually conquering them. Hence within two months he held nearly the whole of Hungary, as far as Pozsony (Pressburg) in his hands. Though the Hungarian Nobility gave the real impetus to the insurrection, a large share of the success must be attributed to the enthusiasm of the the Protestant middle class, which followed Bocskay's traditions.

Having the whole of Hungary, except the Turkish part, in his hands, it depended upon Bethlen's own decision whether he should be crowned king. On 21 September 1619 the Estates-General of Upper Hungary elected him as "Chief and Protector" of the land. But Bethlen's realism and greatness appeared in the very fact that he was never lured from the solid base of reality by magnificent plans and fanciful illusions. The acceptance of the Hungarian crown would have brought him into permanent conflict both with the German and the Turkish powers. The Turk would have recognised Bethlen as king only on condition that he yielded up Transylvania to another Prince: So the much desired unity would have remained a dream as before. "We shall never cede Transylvania to Hungary"—so went the Turkish answer—"for Transylvania was invented by Sultan Suleiman." Bethlen's diplomacy never could get rid of this objection. On the other hand he could not force the Emperor to recognise him as King of Hungary. In the 17th century, Hungary, having lost a large part of her territories, was not able to withstand both East and West simultaneously.

Meanwhile, the hopelessness of the Bohemian rising became more and more manifest. Soon after it was made clear by the defeat of the White Mountain. In the beginning of 1620 Bethlen saw that the Insurrection was a lost cause. Time was in favour of the Emperor, and Spanish help drew nearer. Bethlen began diplomatic transactions in time, being incited also by the Turkophobe disposition of the country. He had sufficient political motives to show a friendly conduct towards the Sultan, but this caused some concern to public opinion, especially in western Hungary. After the fall of Bohemia and the flight of Frederick, Bethlen, being left alone, had to seek a successful issue to his war against the victorious Habsburg. With energy and tenacity he succeeded in forcing a

favourable issue in the Peace of Nikolsburg (1622), which reaffirmed Protestant rights and allowed Bethlen some territorial privileges

But the most essential result was that Transylvania became a strong, wealthy state, capable of fighting. This was the work of Bethlen. He had no hereditary sovereignty. As a nobleman, he was made prince by his own energy and talent. The land he ruled was no longer a second-rate province, but an independent country. On Hungarian soil the evolution of modern Absolutism had broken down with the death of Mathias Corvinus, now Bethlen became a Protestant absolute sovereign. He had his own standing army and made his power felt by the recalcitrant Estates. In building up an up-to-date, modern government, he was helped by the fact that the Estates of Transylvania were less developed than those of Hungary proper. Bethlen was the first Hungarian Protestant Sovereign, conscious of his national and religious mission. The theoretical foundations of his absolute power were supplied by his Protestant clergy. James I of England's book of instructions for his son, which contained the theories of contemporary Protestant absolutism and emphasised the leading role of the king, was widely read throughout Transylvania in a Hungarian translation, with an introductory poem by Albert Szenczi Molnár, an outstanding figure in Hungarian literature.

The economic consolidation of Transylvania, as well as its political rise, was Bethlen's personal work. According to the usual practice of monarchs in the early period of capitalism, he endeavoured to crush the influence of the Estates on State finances and to strengthen the country's economic position by monopolies and commercial enterprises. Lacking expert advisers, Bethlen followed his own ideas, supported industry and commerce and showed his practical mind in regulating import and export, with such success, that his annual income was nearly doubled and amounted to more than half a million florins. While the Emperor's money-troubles were almost proverbial, Bethlen, whose economic policy shows certain signs of mercantilism, had always considerable financial reserves at his disposal.

This political and economic reorganisation<sup>2</sup> contributed towards a new revival of Hungarian Protestant culture in Transylvania. The Prince himself preferred his study in the Renaissance Palace in Gyulafehérvár to the pleasures and carousals of martial life. He

<sup>2</sup> Connections between Protestantism and anti-feudal political ideas were pointed out by Otto Hintze, *Kalvinismus und Staatsräson in Brandenburg*, 1930.

spent most of his time in intense mental activity, discussion and writing. His enormous political correspondence which has come down to us, bears proof of his very exceptional literary talent, his sharp eye for psychology and his original political reasoning. The Transylvanian schools and colleges already had great traditions, but Bethlen wanted to create a University also. Though he invited German professors into his service, it was in keeping with Bethlen's policy that German influence was counterbalanced in Transylvania by connections with Italy and with the western countries. The young men of the educated classes—this was a typical symptom of eastern and central European history—made journeys to western Europe to complete their studies.<sup>3</sup> Many of them would certainly have read with a smile the remark of that haughty Frenchmen, the Duke of Angoulême, who sent on a diplomatic mission to Bethlen at Pozsony, probably expecting to find a petty Balkan despot, exclaimed with surprise, "Rien de barbare!"

At the head of his new-built principality, Bethlen was destined to become a factor of importance in European politics. His exceptional diplomatic talent enabled him to transcend the narrow limits of the Turkish-Austrian political horizon and to have his say in the political ensemble of the Powers. Though inexperienced, he was not a credulous newcomer perplexed by the international texture of avowed intentions, secret ideas and concealed interests. Diplomatic webs were flimsy to his sober-sighted eyes. Naturally, he adopted the methods of the European diplomacy of his time. He worked out pompous plans—in different directions at the same time—which changed very easily. But he himself never believed in any diplomatic embroidery. He belonged to the rare sort of statesmen who were not to be taken in even by his own ideas. Bethlen never listened to the fantastic plans of adventurers who so often played a predominant role in this early—we may say naive—period of international diplomacy. He never underestimated the forces of his enemies—a common fault at a time when little was known of foreign countries owing to lack of statistics and reliable information.

Bethlen's policy was not easy to understand, but always conscious. He was led by the same "*raison d'état*" in Hungarian politics as was the Catholic king of France in the German Protestant Alliance. All Bethlen's plans served the same aim; namely the restoration of

<sup>3</sup> A letter of Bethlen to the Duke of Buckingham recommending Count Peter Bethlen to him in his travels in England, is to be found in the British Museum's Collection. (Date 27 August, 1627.)

Hungarian unity and power under his own rule. Thus the man who was opposed to the Habsburgs both personally and politically, started negotiations with Vienna with a view to asking the Emperor's daughter in marriage. He showed himself to be willing to recognise the Emperor's supremacy in the event of a reunion of Transylvania with Hungary proper. In reality, the proposal signified that Bethlen wished to govern the whole of Hungary, though under the Emperor's nominal supremacy, but retaining sufficient power in his hands for further action.

One result of his diplomatic activities—inspired by the extreme caution demanded by Transylvania's position—was that Bethlen's adversaries called him incalculable and unreliable. Sir Thomas Roe, the English Minister in Constantinople, openly avowed that he did not understand Bethlen. He used to close his reports on Bethlen's actions with the remark: "But all this is dissimulation<sup>4</sup>." Bethlen's enemies spread throughout Europe the charge of his being pro-Turkish, treacherous and untrustworthy. These and similar charges were echoed by contemporary publicists, and, as often happens, they were also believed and repeated by later historians. According to this naive and conventional description, Bethlen was "ambitieux, inquiet et inconstant, aucun serment ne liait sa bonne foi", and he used his talent against Christianity, even against his own nation<sup>5</sup>! Dyer's *History of Modern Europe* is not more friendly towards him: "Gabor [i.e. Bethlen] had betrayed the native treachery of his character in the way in which he had obtained possession of his dominions." Dyer quotes the words of Sir Isaac Wake, the English Minister at Venice, who "characterised (Bethlen) as a Janus with one face towards Christendom and another towards Turkey<sup>6</sup>." The *Cambridge Modern History* calls him a "remarkable personage," but "double faced" and "half barbarian in his ways of life", an allegation, which even the contemporary foreign eye-witnesses did not believe.

After his first campaign Bethlen did not remain inactive. Several times he attempted again the realisation of the scheme. He had his special methods in political and military actions: After careful preparation, safeguarding his rear against the Turk, he made a lightning attack on the Emperor and enforced peace at the right moment. But since Bethlen became a significant factor in the anti-

<sup>4</sup> The Negotiations of Sir Thomas Roe.

<sup>5</sup> *Biographie universelle ancienne et moderne*. Paris, 1843, Vol. IV.

<sup>6</sup> Vol. III, 196, 212.

Habsburg European coalition, he was no longer isolated in his political and military enterprises.

In 1624 English foreign policy took a favourable turn to Bethlen whose diplomatic position was also furthered by his marriage with Catherine of Brandenburg. James I gave up his scheme of a marriage alliance with the Spanish Habsburgs, a plan which prevented England from playing an active part in the European coalition directed against the Habsburgs in Central Europe. Frederick, the Bohemian king, who fled to Holland, in vain asked the King of England, his father-in-law King James, for help. Hitherto Bethlen could have no hope in an English alliance, all the more so owing to the strictly legitimist opinions of James I, who regarded with suspicion the actions of an aggressor against the lawful Hungarian Habsburg-King. "His Majestie hitherto would never have anything with him," wrote Calvert to Sir Thomas Roe in 1622. But Bethlen's European position improved more and more. In 1623 Dutch and Transylvanian delegates co-operated in Bethlen's diplomatic actions at Constantinople. In 1624, Richelieu took in hand the direction of French policy and organised the German Protestants against the Emperor. Gradually the circle was formed around the Empire—England, France, the German Protestants, Denmark, Sweden and, in the east, Transylvania had common interests against the Habsburgs. By the Treaty of Westminster, Bethlen was admitted, as a member with equal rights, to the Coalition created by the pact of the Hague. In the new period of the Thirty Years' War Bethlen again led a successful campaign, while from the north Mansfeld's Protestant army threatened the Imperial Forces. But this military co-operation was not really successful, because Wallenstein, the Imperial commander-in-chief, utterly defeated Mansfeld and started eastwards with his victorious army. Again Bethlen was isolated, as in the Bohemian war, because of the defeat of his ally. For a moment, near Pozsony, the two armies and the two leaders, Bethlen and Wallenstein, stood facing each other, but neither of them dared risk a decisive battle. Bethlen was alone, his western allies were far away. He was not a paid mercenary soldier like Mansfeld, he never risked his fatherland's fate if he felt there was any danger. But, although his success was not complete, Bethlen again succeeded in making peace on terms favourable to the Hungarian cause (1626).

In the last three years of his life, when the anti-German coalition failed to produce any decisive result, Bethlen turned his attention to Poland. At the time of the Polish war, Gustavus Adolphus invited Bethlen to take common action against Sigismund III, the



Catholic king of Poland. The co-operation of the two Protestant absolute sovereigns would have constituted a decisive force. Nevertheless, it would have meant a competition for the throne after their victory. Bethlen had his own plans concerning Poland and did not accept this offer. He was interested in the Polish question, not only because Sigismund III had certain sympathies towards the Habsburgs and often caused difficulties in Bethlen's western campaigns. Bethlen had before him the historical precedent of Stephen Báthory, Prince of Transylvania who, after becoming king of Poland, defeated the Russian Tsar Ivan the Terrible, assured his country's independence towards the Emperor and intended to lead an East-European coalition against the Turks. Báthory realised that Hungary and Poland had common interests and that the East-Central European territories could maintain their independence between East and West only by uniting their forces. Báthory's traditions survived during the whole of the 17th century. In 1616, George Thurzó wrote to Bethlen: "If the Turks attack Poland, Transylvania will feel the effect of it" and "Get Transylvania into trouble, this will be a danger not to our country only but to the whole of Christianity<sup>7</sup>."

His early death in 1630 prevented Bethlen from finishing the diplomatic preparation of his Polish scheme. In him his nation lost one of the most remarkable personalities of modern Hungarian history. Bethlen was not successful in re-establishing the ancient Hungarian unity, but he united the Hungarian Protestant forces against the Habsburgs and by this step created historical traditions for later centuries. His greatness lies in the fact that in the age of Turkish inroads and of the Thirty Years' War he raised his country to a European position, safeguarded its political security and kept alive the intellectual and economic development and the traditions of European civilization among an isolated, eastern people. He had to defy immense difficulties, but his faith never wavered. In his last hour when he could no longer speak, he asked for pen and put down the following words: "If God is with us, who is against us? Nobody, certainly nobody."

DOMINIC KOSÁRY.

<sup>7</sup> Szilágyi, *Bethlen's political correspondence*. (Budapest 1887) p 53.

# KAROL SZYMANOWSKI

1883-1937

FOR thirty years the creative genius of Karol Szymanowski illumined the cultural life of Poland. From the moment when, in 1905, he made his appearance for the first time as the composer of charming piano *Preludes* (Opus 1), his splendid gifts were duly appraised, and men saw in him rightly the heir of the ideals of Chopin. The prophecy was ventured that his art would lend fresh lustre to Polish music, and would draw on him the attention of the whole world.

He was only twenty-two at the time; but the *Preludes* had been written before the age of eighteen, when this capacity to express himself in such perfect, though relatively modest forms, could not as yet have come from any teacher of theory. In point of fact, he owed it exclusively to his own unfailing instinct, and to the rarely artistic atmosphere in which he grew up on the family estate Tymoszwowka, in far-away Ukraina. Bach and Beethoven, Chopin and Wagner, the masters whom his musically endowed father esteemed so highly, were the composer Szymanowski's only teachers. Knowledge of their masterpieces, and the exploring of the secrets of their skill in composition, prepared him at an early age for the hardest tasks, and for setting himself the highest of goals.

Along with these small piano pieces went early the composing of songs. The first poet to inspire them was Casimir Tetmayer—then the Coryphæus of the Polish lyric, “poet of love and sadness, of unsatisfied cravings, and of bacchic intoxication.” Six of his subtle lyrics, with varying descriptive *motifs*, found the due response of musical inspiration in the nature of the young Szymanowski, already disposed to melancholy meditations. The very choice he made of the poems revealed the level of his own artistic appreciation. The songs appeared later as Opus 2. The dimensions of the composer's talent, firm and sure already in expression, were further shown by melodies he now wrote to *Three Fragments* from the works of Kasprowicz. In these we find an elemental power of dramatic expression bursting forth, the ardour of religious transport, and the use of folk-motifs raised to the plane of the fantastic. These songs became known as Opus 5. Into this lofty view of the world, which drove Szymanowski to follow in life the path of the highest artistic ideals without fear of storms or obstacles, the work of another poet, Wacław Berent, melted at once; notably one poem, *The Swan*. With this composition Szymanowski uttered his artistic *Credo*.

Very soon, however, he was to be drawn into the magic circles of his poetic transpositions of the world of the senses, into a kaleidoscopic acquaintance with seas and stars, people and spirits, angels and dragons, by still another Polish writer, the quite irrational singer of Young Poland, Tadeusz Micinski. Here the musician found materials for two lyrical cycles—Opus 11, four songs, and Opus 20, six songs. Not only the works, but perhaps even more the personal influence of Micinski made a deep impression on the young musician, shook up the furniture of his spirit, and reinforced his search for the boldest ideals of composition. Thus, as we see, his genius was to grow out of the very soil of the nation's culture and traditions; in that from the outset it took to its bosom the ennobling work of the poets of his own day, and so identified itself with the spiritual atmosphere of the Poland all about him. Alone of the musicians of his time, Szymanowski, by the generic weight of his abilities, could do justice to the poetical creations of four men—Tetmayer, Kasprowicz, Berent and Micinski.

In 1902 he came to Warsaw. In that same city, where the genius of Chopin had evolved, Szymanowski now underwent a severe training in counterpoint. His teacher was the eminent composer, Sigmund Noskowski. The result was that, when in 1906 he gave new proof of his aims as a musician in a series of larger works, there was no lack of voices proclaiming his gifts as those of a genius. From now onward his personality showed itself with increasing clearness in all kinds of musical creations, produced from one year to another. his piano *Etudes* (Opus 4) his first *Sonata* for the piano (Opus 8), his romantic *Sonata* for piano and violin (Opus 9), his admirable *Variations* on a folk-melody (Opus 10), and a number of new songs. One could easily infer from these early productions, that the young artist had in his ideals no shadow of the commonplace, no cheapness of technical mediums. As with every outstanding master of music, so with him one saw from the start the fulness of his individuality and the bold evolution of his style unfolding themselves around an axis all his own, around the crystallisation of his own spirit.

The style of the works belonging to this early period, brought Szymanowski in certain respects nearer to Chopin and to Wagner; in others, however, nearer to Schumann and Brahms. To Richard Strauss as well, for instance in the *Concert Overture*, and in his first *Symphony*. In his earlier songs one finds features recalling

Rachmaninov, while his later ones remind us of Max Reger. Nevertheless, even with all these elements of kinship, the language of the new composer's works was of his own invention. They were all born of an innate necessity to create music, of the inevitable, compelling need for expression of a typically romantic spirit. This does not imply, however, that he failed to acquire for himself a technique in counterpoint which might make one's head go round.

The year 1911-12 opened for him the path to fame in the wider world, when in Berlin, Leipzig and Vienna the two works were performed that revealed his creative powers in their maturity: the *Second Symphony* (Opus 19) and the *Second Sonata* for piano (Opus 21). These two compositions, a masterly synthesis of the sonata's form with that of the *Variations* and the *Fugue*, represent a shining light in music in the closing years of pre-war Europe. They are like a splendid bridge between the legacy of the æsthetic of Bach and Beethoven, and the spirit of modern art.

## I

Karol Szymanowski was a wondrously rich personality, composed of a variety of elements. The fine intellect of the composer did not exclude from his soul those emotions whose roots are in religion. It is to this side of his nature that we owe the appearance, even in his early years, of a number of moving lyric pieces with a religious content. For kindred reasons there found entrance into the mind of this typical west-European musical genius currents that arose in the musical East. It was the profound poet of ancient Persia, Hafis, whose delicate verses drew the Pole to the mysterious charm of the Orient, and aroused him to write a number of unusually subtle songs. Later on, Djelaleddin Rumi was to unfold the mystical tones of his *Song of the Night* before Szymanowski's imagination, and he at once proceeded to incorporate them in his *Third Symphony*. At a later stage he became an unrivalled interpreter of the musical idiom of the East. The heights of his art in this respect are found in *Songs of the Mad Muezzin*, the words of which were written for him by the Polish poet, Jarosław Iwaszkiewicz. This fame, as the inspired singer of the Orient, did not come, however, from any wearisome studies carried on by the author in the field of Eastern music. The *motifs* used for these works were assembled by his own intuition. Their variety seems to us almost incredible: whether on the side of melody, or in their singular harmonies and the strange nuances of their rhythms.

Until the outbreak of the Great War, Szymanowski spent most

of his time in the cities of central Europe. He travelled much, but settled in Vienna in 1911, and remained there two years. The famous music firm, *Universal-Edition*, had undertaken to publish all his new pieces as soon as they were finished. For the summers he always returned to the still country-side of Ukraine, where he toiled diligently at composition.

To the works already mentioned, belonging to this early period of production, belongs also an opera. It was written in Vienna, and the author could ascribe its writing to his sojourn there. The libretto for *Hagith*—such was its name—was the work of a Viennese poet, Felix Dörmann; the theme was taken from the Old Testament. Everything in the words was done in a drastic, glittering style, recalling Wilde's *Salome*. The hero is the old king, the David of the Scripture, but unnamed. Between him and his son, Prince Solomon, stands Hagith, who, in defiance of the royal will, is afterwards stoned. She has orders from the High-priest to surrender herself to the aged monarch, in the hope that thereby his powers may be restored. Nonetheless she succeeded in preserving her maiden honour, desiring that the speedy death of the king may hasten the accession of the prince, with whom she had fallen in love at first sight. Solomon was banished to the borders of the kingdom; but he was only leaving the city when he heard of his father's death, and of the verdict of stoning for Hagith. He hurried back to save her, but he was too late.

Szymanowski was hoping that his opera would be performed in the *Hofoper* in Vienna. He finished it in 1913, equipping the parts with all the richness of musical instrumentation then at the disposal of a group, at whose head stood Strauss himself. In his style the Pole had the models of *Salome* and *Elektra* before him; yet he wove into his works wholly original concepts, and in places he achieved the charm of rare beauty of melody, together with an arresting mastery of construction of thunderous harmonies. Thanks to the war, the première of *Hagith* was not celebrated till 1922, and then in the Grand Opera in Warsaw.

The tragic years 1914–1918, and the first two years of the Bolshevik revolution, Szymanowski spent in Russia, in fearful circumstances that grew worse from week to week. Toward the end of 1919 he succeeded in escaping from this Hades, and in returning home to Warsaw. Here he arrived with a whole treasure of new works, among them the *Third Symphony*, with tenor solo and

Chorus, to the words of Djelaleddin Rumi's *Song of the Night*, a *Violin Concerto*, and a *Cycle* of three violin compositions, *Myths—The Fountain of Arethusa, Narcissus, and Pan and the Dryads*. During this time he had also written the *Third Sonata* for piano, twelve *Etudes* for piano, a *String Quartet*, several new songs, and two large cycles of piano pieces *The Metopes* and *The Masques*. To the former belong *The Isle of the Sirens, Calypso, Nausicaa*, the fruit of a journey to Sicily in 1914 and of the reading of the *Odyssey*; to the latter *Scheherezade, Tantris the Buffoon, and The Serenade of Don Juan*.

If of the first period of Szymanowski's writing we may say that in spirit he belonged to the Romantic camp, but in form to classical models, about the works he brought back to Warsaw in 1919 it must be said that they are the resultant force of romantic foundations wedded to impressionism. His pre-war compositions could be reduced to the common denominator of German musical ideals, as we know them from Bach to Reger. His stay in Paris in 1914, his contacts with French civilisation and his separation from the German centres toward which he had hitherto gravitated, brought about an orientation in other directions and toward other models and ideals. Not only did French letters and painting attract him, but also the impressionism of Debussy's school: the lightness of his colouring, the subtlety of his musical pictures, not to mention their freedom from the academic, and from the ballast of traditional habits and mannerisms. For a talent so many-sided and dynamic as Szymanowski's, this discovery amounted to a new lease of creative freedom. It opened up for him gateways to hitherto unknown possibilities in the realm of ways and means in composition. This was at once revealed both in his piano and his violin works, published after his return to Poland. He now broadened the scope of his virtuosity to a fantastic extent; to what would seem to be the utmost limits of capacity in the human fingers. What Debussy achieved with the help of two pianos (the three compositions *En Blanc et Noir*, unknown to the Pole when he wrote *The Metopes* and *The Masques*) was now seen to be but a part of the technical richness of these works, only a fragment of the scale of colouring they possessed. There followed also, in this new period, a complete emancipation of his harmony from the bonds of tonality and consonance. In this respect the art of Szymanowski has rivalled the extremest conceptions of Stravinsky and Schönberg, at the same time anticipating the ultra-radicalism of Darius Milhaud in that swaggering, grotesque work, the *Fugue* in the last part of the *Violin Quartet* (Opus 37).

The impression made by the appearance of the new piano

compositions was enormous. Nevertheless, everything they offered that was new had its starting point in the composer's earlier piano pieces, where we had always admired his truly demonic impetus in achieving effects. No one could foresee, however, that even the violin works of this second period would introduce us to a wholly new world of technical conquests, and one discovered by Szymanowski himself. It is a fact that the *Concerto* with Orchestra accompaniment, Opus 35, based on the poem *May Night* by Micinski (something the composer did not tell us in the published edition) was an epoch-making occurrence almost on a plane with the first appearance of Paganini's work. One is frankly astounded that a musician, who never had a violin in his hand, should succeed in acquiring all the secrets of technique of this instrument which only a violinist can fathom, and in raising them to a degree that reminds us of nobody else except the great Italian.

Just as the closing work of Szymanowski's first period was an opera, so also a dramatic creation completed the second. This time, however, it was not something thrust upon him by his environment, as was *Hagith*, but the voice of a spirit calling from the depths of his own yearnings which then became the expression of his lofty ideal of composition, saturated with the worship of beauty in its most detached form. It was, moreover, the voice of faith in the saving mission of this beauty for humanity. The first outlines of the work came upon the author during his stay in Sicily in 1914, its background being the ancient culture of the island—Greek, Arabic and Christian. Later he saw clearly before him the figure of King Roger II, around which there wove itself a most original tale, symbolic throughout. The title assumed was the name of the king, but a second was added, *The Shepherd*. This shepherd was the emissary of Dionysus, the god of joyous beauty, born of the sea-foam and the sun's rays. With the help of his friend Iwaskiewicz, Szymanowski wrote the *libretto* himself, getting thereby his own arrangement of the action. We are taken first to the Capella Palatina in Palermo, glittering with golden mosaics, then to the palace court-yard of the Sicilian caliphs, and finally to the ruins of the antique theatre at Taormina—backwards through the three ages of Sicilian history. We witness scenes, whose content symbolises the deliverance of humanity from the tyranny of ossified Byzantine formalism, into the understanding of the divine sense of all that is—including man himself. On this background of most effective stage

arrangements, combining to give the beholder a fairyland of colour and contrast, there are revealed the composer's profoundest desires, given expression toward the end in the words of the king himself, as he is being initiated into the Dionysian mysteries. As a production *King Roger* stands by itself. From every point of view it is an exceptional work. How can one indicate its significance? For my part, I do not hesitate to place it over against *Parsifal*, and on an equal footing. We saw it on the stage for the first time in Warsaw in 1926. Since then it has been performed in several other centres on the continent.

## II

The whole productive career of Szymanowski has arranged itself as if according to a pre-conceived plan as if some provision had been made for him at the outset by an overseeing Providence, whose instrument he has since then been. He came home after the war as the Singer of the East and the West, as the interpreter of ancient myths, and of Dionysiac mysteries. Like Ulysses, he returned after long journeys among strangers in order to become, during the last decade of his life, "the troubadour of the unsullied purity of Polish national tradition." For some time he sought the way to the sources of those musical elements in which the spirit and instinct of the Polish people had been revealed in its real form. For years his health had been causing concern, and its demands drove him now to Zakopane, to the life-giving slopes of the Tatra mountains.

He was thus coming back, fortunately for us, to the spring from which he had drawn the beautiful theme of the *Variations* (Opus 10) in his earliest years. Now he would drink from it once more. During months and years of residence in Zakopane, his musical imagination was powerfully influenced and moulded by the incomparably original *motifs* to be found in the dances and songs of the Highlanders—*Gorale*. The fateful lot of the tubercular victim was to work for good, for the fulfilling of a mighty mission to Polish music. Seeking in these High Carpathians healing for the disease that was consuming him, Szymanowski found there wondrous impulses to a fresh flowering of his art.

The first work to become the expression of this new phase was the cycle of six songs, with piano accompaniment, published in 1923 and called *Śtopiewnie*. The words were those of the poet Julius Tuwim. The title itself, a neologism made up of the two words *słowo* and *pienie* ("word" and "song"), prepares us for the originality of these curious creations of a daring poet, creations that are a play on sounds, on parts of speech having no logical content, but



which flow together in a stream of rhythmical unities and mingle in a girdle of changing colours. The raw materials of Tuwim's verses compelled the composer to adopt elements of musical language, which are fitted to them as if by a genius. There is nothing like them in our musical literature, either vocal or instrumental. The tune-motifs had to be no less original than the yoking of the poet's syllables to them. Szymanowski did not shrink from this labour of an excursion into unknown regions of musical experiment to seek out these new mediums, which could only be found in the hidden reaches of his own genius. His instinct for composition gave him the thread of Ariadne. The other end of it was tied to the primitive, to the barbarities of the Highland music, which by its very difference from that of other central European stocks, attracted the composer as the promised land of Polish music. He distilled the style of *Śłopiewnie* out of the raw themes, the discordant songs and dances of the Zakopane region; and he created in this new cycle of lyrics an artistic work, unique and wholly his own.

His soul being thus soaked in the melodies of the *Gorale*, Szymanowski could now begin to carry further the task begun a century ago by Chopin: that of raising the folk-lore of Poland in our time to a significance for humanity as a whole. New evidence of the boldness of his doings was soon seen in the dances that now began to appear, one after the other, *Mazurki* (Opus 50). Here the author was able to emancipate himself from the influence of Chopin, which can be felt in all other composers of mazurkas in the second half of the 19th century. This was possible, thanks to the transporting of the typical Polish dance from the plains of Mazowia to the highlands of the Tatras. Here he imposed on it characteristic rhythm *motifs* that flowed from his spirit in the presence of the upland meadows under the granite cliffs; on which shepherds and maidens boldly improvise new songs, or repeat again those that have been handed down from the past.

Three real masterpieces were in time to be the result of Szymanowski's converse with the folk-music of the Tatras. The first was one which grips the inmost soul: a great religious composition, *Stabat Mater*, set to a Polish version of the original Latin, and written for solo voices, a mixed choir and orchestra. The theme of this work has no immediate connection with Highland music, but the Lechite (i.e. old Polish) spirit of the music flowed undoubtedly from the heart-felt attachment to folk-art that absorbed the whole being of the artist. It was written in 1925-26. Its style is a clever harmonising of archaic mediums of melody with a wholly new

conception of the demands of liturgy, freed from all the official formulas of church music. After the Paris performance in 1929, the eminent French critic, Coeuroy, did not hesitate to assay *Slabat Mater* as one of the most original religious compositions ever written.

In 1926 Szymanowski became Director of the State Conservatory in Warsaw. Two years later, however, he laid down the office, both for reasons of health and because of his desire for greater freedom in his enterprises as composer. Though his illness had not yet revealed itself openly, it was already making havoc with his organism. In spite of this, he nevertheless succeeded in adding to the work that had transported him into the sphere of religious meditation, a second masterpiece of a diametrically opposite nature. It was a ballet, with Tatra life as background, which united *motifs* from the legendary past with episodes from the life and customs of today. In its outlines, the scenery of the work was of the author's own making. Its title, *Harnasie*, was taken from the name given to the fierce Tatra bandits of long ago. The composer had listened much during his years at Zakopane to these robber stories; and at times he had been witness, during parties in the Goral cottages (whether those of betrothal or wedding), of how the legend of the quarrelsome past can become a no less quarrelsome reality in the present. Love, envy and the will to vengeance on a rival get the better of the usually calm tempers of the mountain folk, to the violent shedding of blood. Something of the verve of these sturdy dwellers under the Tatras was imparted to Szymanowski as he wrote the parts for the ballet. The music has something in common with features of *Słopiewnie*. Out of it there breaks forth the rhythmic vigour of the actual Highland dances; in structure it recalls the architectural compactness of the Goral cottage. These are marks we do not find in the author's earlier works, which were often dissolved in the mists of his own contemplative nostalgia.

In 1929 his illness took on tragic proportions. For nearly a year he had to go out to Davos, whence he came back in seemingly better health, thanks to careful treatment. He could thus accept the Rectorship of the newly opened Academy of Music in Warsaw, whither he would travel for short sojourns from Zakopane. But he did not neglect composition. From this time dates his powerful hymn *Veni Creator*, to a poetic paraphrase of Wyspianski; and a new instrumental masterpiece, the *Fourth Symphony*, with *Piano Concerto*. He wrote this, thinking of himself as the artist of the

*Concerto*; hoping in this way to come into closer personal contact with the musical world, and no longer make but rare appearances as accompanist to his own songs. (Their best interpreter has always been the composer's own sister, Stanisława.) Again, in the writing of this *Symphony*, Szymanowski owed much to his intimate knowledge of Highland music, from whose blood and bone many a *motif* was drawn here also. Nevertheless this work is far more than just a musical poem on the life of the men who pasture their sheep among the granite cliffs of the High Tatras. It is a part of Nature herself: of the rocks that lose themselves in the clouds, of the winds that burst upon and tear up the forests by the roots, and of the silence that can become sound both when the sun is shining, and when only the stars are visible.

### III

In this sketch of the genius of Szymanowski we cannot close without at least a few sentences about the literary side of his work. Only in ripe years did he begin to write, at first by fits and starts, as when he helped with the text of *King Roger*. His need for expression showed itself in 1922 in the form of polemics with the Warsaw critics, who were unfavourably disposed to his post-war style. At once we saw the striking talent of the writer, based on broad cultural foundations, and wielding a splendid pen. He showed rare trenchancy of defence in his arguments; he would go over to the attack with unexpected moves, and would grip the reader by the profundity with which he stated the problem. Later he shone as an essayist in his study of Chopin, published in 1925: in whose well-written pages he recorded the most effective comments on the significance, for the history of Polish culture, of that master's art. In his capacity as Rector of the Academy he published a treatise on *The Educational Rôle of Music in the Social Order*, which was both broad in concept and thorough in its detail. In addition, he took the field in a number of other matters pertaining to the cultural life of the capital—for instance, in questions related to modern music in general and to religious music in particular.

His last years brought a steady decline in physical fitness, and a growing consciousness of the approaching end of his struggle for health: a condition of things he sought by all means to hide from others. Nor did fate spare him still other vexations quite apart from this, his chief one. After one year, the Academy he founded was transformed into something different. He withdrew from it, since neither its character nor its structure suited his convictions.

Even his material circumstances were not easy, for his poor health hindered him from serious work. He lived in a modest log cottage in Zakopane, leaving it from time to time for concert tours which took him to a growing number of neighbouring countries. Everywhere he was met with unanimous expressions of recognition, and with admiration for his work. In November, 1935, he left Zakopane—for good. He lived to see the enthusiastic reception of his *Harnasie* in Paris in April, 1936. Afterwards he spent some summer months in Warsaw, never free from illness; and he left in the autumn for southern France in a hopeless battle with tuberculosis. From thence they brought him back—almost in his last agony—in the closing day of March, 1937, to Lausanne. Here he breathed his last on 29 March.

It is not easy to express in a brief paper all that Szymanowski's work in general signifies as art, and how great is its richness of content. I should like to express this difficulty more precisely, as well as to show how far afield in the world of metaphors one must go to make manifest the inexpressible, by citing some comments made by the Neapolitan critic, Guido Pannain. They are taken from his study of the Pole's work:

"Szymanowski is an author out of the *Thousand and One Nights*. I do not know who taught him his mastery of tone, but it surely must have been a magician. There is something of Nostradamus and Cagliostro in this passionate charmer, with the sweet smile of a woman, the hands of a Liszt, the mind of a Wagner, and the heart of a Debussy. He is as though a descendant of Chopin, whom some Kipling's fancy has initiated into the secrets of the Jungle. A hunter for diamonds, who has descended deep into the mines of the orchestra. The professor and the poet have clasped hands in this man, and shaped in him a chord of a new kind. He is the Romantic spirit, soaked in Impressionism, and hung on the skeleton of a gladiator."

In pregnant and clear-cut terms the same French critic, André Coeuroy, has made the following observations, summing up the art and influence of Szymanowski:

"He has performed the miracle of weaning Polish music from expressing itself in non-Polish musical language. He is the creator of constantly recurring subtleties in the symphony, in chamber music, in song and in opera. He is the first Pole since Chopin who has revealed the essence of creative genius. The whole art of

Szymanowski is based on logic, though not necessarily of the traditional kind. There is something Latin about his music. His nature is of that of dreamings, of lofty soarings, of magnificence and of intimacy, all of them expressed in the free language of today."

On the diploma, D.Phil. honoris causa, which we gave him in the name of the University of Cracow in December, 1930, the reasons were set forth for this, so well deserved, distinction. We saw in him one of the most daring propagators of contemporary music, one who has enriched the treasure of our national culture, a Master who, in the lofty understanding of his mission and with a heroism worthy of his genius, has always held aloft the banner of the highest ideals, has never lowered the plane of his inspiration to meet the likes and dislikes of the crowd, but has encouraged others, and drawn them after him by noble example.

As one who from the start ventured to draw the attention of others to the greatness of this genius, who was glad to prepare the way for his music because of faith in its historic mission; finally as one who helped to bear his coffin to its last resting-place in the vaults reserved for distinguished Poles in the Skalka church in Cracow, I bow my head before the spirit of him we have lost, as before one who has lighted up all our lives by the splendour of his genius.

*Krakow.*

ZDISEŁAW JACHIMECKI.

## J. E. PURKYNĚ: CZECH SCIENTIST AND PATRIOT (1787-1869)

ON 17 December of last year was the 150th anniversary of Purkyně's birth. His name is well-known to every scientist. Microscopical anatomy, experimental physiology and embryology were the main fields of Purkyně's work, and in all of them he influenced the trend of development substantially. But sometimes a specialist in the history of philosophy, in psychology, botany, zoology, and even in criminology meets his name and testifies to the astonishing versatility of his talent.

But Purkyně has, besides, a special importance for his countrymen the Czechs, because of his part in the national revival. His life-history is not much different from that of the other Czech "awakeners" like Dobrovský, Jungmann, Palacký, Šafařík and many other older and younger contemporaries. He was 14 years younger than Jungmann and almost 10 years older than František Palacký, Pavel J. Šafařík and Jan Kollár, but his life is remarkably similar to both the older and the younger generation's.

In a country deprived by the violent Counter-reformation of its middle and higher strata of society, scholars and poets came from the lower classes, especially from the peasant class, or at most, from the lowest stratum of the middle class.

Purkyně's father was, it is true, a bailiff on the estates of a large landowner, his mother was, however, of pure peasant stock. Purkyně lost his father when he was only six, and it was largely due to the influence of his mother that he remained an enthusiastic Czech all his life. All childhood experiences were for Purkyně decisive. At an early age he accepted his mother's belief in the immortality of the individual soul, from her he also imbibed his intense national feeling. One must admire the persistence of his nationalism, for he came to live in a completely German milieu when he was 10, and only returned to Czech (or at least partly Czech) surroundings when he was 63. His younger brother Joseph, whose life-history was not dissimilar from Jan's, became Germanised.

A talented boy from a poor home had little choice but to enter the priesthood at that time, and Purkyně also was destined for it originally. Prince Dietrichstein, the owner of the Libochovice estate, where Purkyně was born, had also another seat and much land in Southern Moravia, in the little Germanised town of Mikulov (Nikolsburg). There the Piarist Order had a grammar school, and there Purkyně was received when he was 10 as a chorister on

a scholarship. When he had finished his studies at 18 he entered the order, and would have become a priest and a teacher in one of its schools. But the study of the German philosophers, especially of Fichte, and the poet Novalis, made him dissatisfied with this future and fostered a desire to devote himself to natural science. So in 1807 Purkyně left the order and walked via Prague to Libochovice back to his mother. He then studied philosophy and medicine at the University of Prague. This was possible because he became—like the majority of the gifted youths of the time—first a tutor and then a friend in the family of Baron Hildprandt. There access to the higher classes of society was opened to him, there he found friendship and admiration for his character and talents. His enthusiasm carried away others, and he gained many supporters for the national cause.

Purkyně at that time developed a great variety of interests. He was most attracted by poetry. How else could he help his nation, whose development was interrupted by external forces and whose language was in complete decline? Language became the main object of national care, and poetry the best means towards its perfecting. But he did not neglect the study of natural science, though, of course, it was rather unsystematic. The young Purkyně was interested in almost everything. Nothing was too minute for his attention. Now he teaches himself by smell to distinguish individual drugs in the darkness, now he experiments with himself, whether the position of the body during sleep—in relation to the directions of the wind—has an influence on our dreams, now again he studies his own dreams or all sorts of subjective phenomena in seeing. Only at the instance of his fatherly friend Baron Hildprandt Purkyně concluded his studies of medicine by a German dissertation (*Beitrage zur Erkenntnis des Sehens in subjektiver Hinsicht*) in 1819, and became an assistant at the Anatomical Institute of Prague University. Then he was already the friend of all the most important persons in Czech cultural life. He lived, however, almost entirely in German-speaking circles, as Prague in the twenties of the last century had still a German veneer. Only servants and some artisans used Czech exclusively. Those few intellectuals who believed in a national revival, met from time to time at the house of Josef Jungmann. If the roof had fallen in it might have been the end of the Czech national movement. Besides Josef Jungmann, his brother Antonín, a physician, the two brothers Presl, both scientists and founders of the Czech scientific terminology, attended. So of course, did Purkyně. This little band of enthu-

siasts conceived the bold idea of founding a scientific periodical, written exclusively in Czech. To the older generation, especially to Dobrovský, and to a certain extent even to Jungmann, such a project seemed completely Utopian. They knew, of course, that it is laudable to study the history and the language of the nation, but if this had to have any influence one had to write about these things either in Latin or in German. Czech would be of no use.

But the young enthusiasts had their way, and in 1821 they founded the scientific periodical *Krok*, Purkyně christening it after the legendary Czech prince. And the periodical actually did not expire. It came out rather irregularly, it is true, but was kept going till 1840, when another periodical could take over its mission.

Purkyně was not content with his position in the university, however. Very soon he tried to obtain a professorship, but several attempts failed. Only in 1823 did he succeed, leaving Prague to become professor of physiology at the University of Breslau in the very same year in which František Palacký came to Prague from Slovakia. Thus a young and still unknown scientist joined a Prussian university against the wish of the Faculty of Medicine which had another candidate for the chair. Purkyně's appointment was due to Goethe's interest in his original thesis. Either directly or indirectly the poet, who recognised a kindred mind in Purkyně, decided in his favour.

The appointment at Breslau made him concentrate on science most intensively. He had to overcome the hostility of a foreign milieu, he had to prove that the choice of the Prussian Ministry was justified, and in this he fully succeeded. He met very strong opposition in the beginning. Both his colleagues and his students were prejudiced against him. Purkyně had quite a different conception of physiology than at that time prevailed at German universities. First of all, he had a broader conception. According to him physiology had to deal with both the description of living matter and the examination of all chemical and physical changes, concomitant with life, and besides had to find out by experiment the rules according to which processes are going on in living matter. Beyond this, physiology should observe also the subjective side of life; introspection or "autognosy," as Purkyně liked to call it by a name taken over from his rival at Breslau, Gruithusen, was to be the method of investigation. The introduction of the experimental method into physiology was new at German universities at that time, though in France it was already used by Magendie and a little later by Flourens.



In Germany physiology was considered (and so it was also taught) as a subject which was merely explanatory to normal anatomy. Besides, Breslau was the first German university which had a special chair of physiology since 1811.

Purkyně's reforming zeal necessarily met with strong resistance. Purkyně did not carry on research with new methods, but also taught in a new way. He was possibly the first who ever demonstrated physiological experiments during his lectures. And curiously enough it was just his pedagogical work that might have proved fatal to him. For he was not a good lecturer, and his opponents used this deficiency to discredit him. They proposed to the Ministry that a second professor of physiology should be attached to Purkyně, or that he should be forced to follow one of the accepted text-books in his lectures. They also compelled him to relinquish some rooms which had been lent to him for experimental purposes in another building, and he even had to lecture in his own lodgings.

The German biographer of Purkyně comments as follows on this phase of his life: "We cannot, without a feeling of profound admiration, look back at this man who in spite of constant financial difficulties, never hesitated to impose sacrifices both on himself and his family for the sake of the scientific ideal which directed his whole life." The curator of the university described the condition of Purkyně's lodgings in a letter to the Prussian Ministry of Education in these words: "Every room is full of jars, instruments and specimens, and the health of his family is seriously endangered." "And in these lodgings," says his biographer, "stood the cradle of German histology."

These difficulties which harassed Purkyně in Breslau, did not last long. The unwelcome "Austrian" had in the meantime acquired recognition, and even fame by his works, and had become the pride of Breslau University. This put an end at least to the overt hostilities of his colleagues at the Medical Faculty.

His research work dealt both with the physiology of the organs of sense (in papers written either in German or Latin), and with problems which we should call histological today. Both were of far-reaching importance: they did not merely discover new facts, but inspired a whole series of further discoveries made by other scientists. The work on the activities of the sense-organs was especially original. Purkyně was assisted not only by his intuition, which enabled him to pick out important matters from data apparently commonplace, but also by the extraordinary sharpness of his own senses. The majority of these discoveries were made by

the introspective (or as he called it, the "autognostic") method. There were few scientists who could vie with him in this respect. It is well-known that his friend Goethe warned him for a time against this method, fearing that Purkyně might easily become a victim of hypochondria. Nothing, however, went amiss with Purkyně. The work concerning sight is the most important and most highly estimated of these papers based on introspection. But the work on the feeling of giddiness is equally valuable, and so are his observations on sleep and dreams, though these last have been unfortunately neglected.

Purkyně's histological and morphological work is distinguished by unusual experimental skill, which enabled him to discover the germinal vesicle or parent-kernel in a hen's egg, with the help of an ordinary lens as early as 1825

This discovery was of far-reaching importance for embryology. Purkyně also changed the contemporary views of nervous tissue. On the basis of observations arrived at with very primitive technical means he showed that the central part, the axial fibre, is the most important, while its case, the myeline sheath is merely a protective covering. He was actually the first man who ever saw the cylinder axis of the nerve. Before Purkyně the nerve tissue was considered hollow. He was also the first to use the term "cylinder axis" now generally accepted.

It would seem from these two examples that Purkyně put great stress on the technical side of the morphological sciences. He was really a pioneer in this direction. It is no great exaggeration if we call him the founder of microscopic technique. In his Institute at Breslau the instrument which today is generally called microtome was first constructed and used, and we can scarcely imagine research in microscopical anatomy without it. He was the first who ever photographed microscopical cuts. Of course, only in daguerrotype. He introduced also a whole series of special methods for the microscopical examination of individual tissues of the animal body. We may mention especially the preparing of bones before the cutting by microtome. We have an eye-witness's account of the skill with which Purkyně was able to prepare, even at 80, though with the trembling hand of an old man. But he himself did not lay great stress on the technical side of the question. He introduced many of his technical discoveries in his Institute, some of them he demonstrated only in a circle of experts, but he only wrote on very few of them. We know of the majority of his discoveries in this field only from the accounts of his pupils.

He himself, however laid much more stress on perception. The eye of the scientist must be led by a special instinct. The activity of our senses determines the direction of further research, and even the conclusions which must follow from it necessarily. Research must be a labour of love. The microscope and all other accessories are only of subordinate importance.

When, however, the Prussian Government bought a large microscope, which then was the very peak of technical perfection, for Purkyně's Institute in 1832, his method of research also profited considerably. He himself wrote about it: "With ravenous hunger I examined all the fields of animal and plant histology and came to the conclusion that the newly acquired material would prove inexhaustible. Almost every day brought new discoveries. . . ."

The nervous system remained Purkyně's speciality. He was actually the first to describe correctly the most important microscopical part of the brain and spinal cord, the ganglion cell. It is true that there were some descriptions before him, but his were extraordinarily complete. The naturalists of all nations expressed their gratitude for his work in this field by calling the largest ganglion cells of the human body in the cortex of the cerebellum "Purkyně cells." But even greater was Purkyně's achievement in laying down for the first time that the ganglion cells are the most important part of the nervous system from the functional point of view, and further that the nervous fibres which form the white mass, are connected with these cells and are not, as it was up till then surmised, independent units. These discoveries are particularly characteristic for Purkyně's method. He did not prove his opinion by details carefully assembled, nor did he arrive at them by long reflections and special research. He expressed them immediately on starting to study the question. He was also conscious that he did not arrive at this discovery—just as at many others—by strictly rational methods, but that imagination played, as he himself said, an important part in his mind: the work of the poet and the scientist were not fundamentally different.

Besides the nervous system Purkyně also devoted much attention to the skin, the bones, the teeth and a number of other organs. He ascertained that the furrows on the surface of the skin vary with individuals. This laid the foundations of dactyloscopy.

Purkyně disliked, especially during the time of his greatest activity, anything like compilation. "The drudgery of authorship" always repelled him. But in later years he had to make certain concessions to friends and relatives and to the German environment

in which he lived, and which was always clamouring for "hand-books." In spite of this pressure he never wrote a text-book, leaving this work to his ablest pupil and collaborator of many years, Valentin. We must welcome the fact that he wrote at least a few synthetic papers in later years: only from them do we learn about many of his experiments and investigations, about which he either did not write at all before, or which he discussed only in lectures to the local Society in Breslau.

Purkyně did not like writing on the whole. He did not care for personal fame and recognition. Many of his discoveries are preserved only in the work of his pupils. Only in advanced age, when a world-wide fame loaded him with honours of every description, among them with a fellowship of the Royal Society, and at the end of his life with an Austrian knighthood, Purkyně took care that he should leave behind him a fairly systematic survey of his scientific work. He wrote it for *Živa*, the first periodical exclusively devoted to the natural sciences in Czech, which Purkyně had founded (in the volumes for 1857 and 1858). We learn from this survey how many things Purkyně merely started, and how well he recognised, to what consequences some suggestions made by him may lead. But usually some new idea took hold of his mind, and discoveries in another field claimed his attention. It is astonishing how many of Purkyně's suggestions were followed up only during the present century.

Up to recent times Purkyně suffered some injustice, especially in one matter, obviously largely because of his reluctance to publish his results. This is the question of the so-called "cellular theory," which is usually ascribed to Schwann, who in 1836 put forward the theory that both the body of a plant and of an animal consists of units which were long known in plants as "cells." But Purkyně had expressed his conviction of the structural unity of both plants and animals already two years before Schwann, and he also formulated the difference between the animal body and the plant. He rejected the name of cell for the animal body because it has no skin like the cell of a plant, and he used the term "*Körnchen*" for the animal cell because it stresses that its most important part is what is usually called the kernel or "nucleus." In this respect he was much in advance of his time, and it was only later that his conception won general acceptance through the work of Schultze.

We have only mentioned the most important work of Purkyně from the time of his greatest inspiration. It would be, besides, necessary to speak of his work in pharmacology, which was also

epoch-making, for Purkyně connected pharmacology with physiology in method, and made experiments on his own body. Nor have we mentioned his important work on the structure of the heart which was carried out only during this century by Tawar, etc. But we wanted rather to characterise Purkyně's work in general terms.

It seemed as if scientific work absorbed Purkyně completely. One would think that one could reach such far-reaching results only by indifference to any other interests. But this was not the case. Purkyně at the same time carried on a very extensive correspondence with Czech, Polish and Russian literary men. The aim of this correspondence was to inform other countries, especially in the West, of what was happening in the contemporary world of Slavonic culture. Through his good offices reports about these matters appeared in the *Jahrbücher für wissenschaftliche Kritik*. He found time to translate Czech poetry into German. He translated also folksongs from Lithuanian into German. (Purkyně was an excellent linguist. The Piarist Order appears to have encouraged this talent, for it had a great reputation in this respect in Central Europe. Purkyně spoke and wrote in Czech, German, Polish and Latin. He spoke and understood French, Serbian, Greek, Danish, Lithuanian and Italian.) As an old man of 80 he took part in a congress of physicians at Bratislava (Pressburg) and promised to learn Hungarian. He fulfilled it far enough to be able to translate a play from Hungarian into Czech.

In 1836 at Breslau Purkyně founded a "Slavonic Society," whose task was to cultivate the sciences and arts: its members were mainly Poles from Poznań. Breslau at that time, of course, had lost all consciousness of its Slavonic past, and even of its long association with the Kingdom of Bohemia which had been interrupted only in 1742. Purkyně had many very close relations with Poles and several of his scientific papers were written in Polish. But he also cultivated relations with the Lusatian Serbs, whose intelligentsia was studying then mainly at Breslau. Purkyně especially befriended Smoler, who later became the leader of this small and isolated Slavonic nation.

Purkyně was brought up as a Catholic. But he was convinced that his family was originally Protestant, and he had a theory that his ancestors were punished in 1621 for their faith by expulsion and confiscation of property. This idea seems to have been mistaken, according to recent investigations. Nevertheless, it was probably the main reason why Purkyně searched for memorials of the Bohemian Brethren, the most important Protestant sect, in

Silesia. Its capital, Breslau, had been one of the main places of refuge of the Czech emigrants after the battle on the White Mountain. Purkyně actually found a good many Czech literary monuments, some of them even dating back to the 14th century. The most important find he made was probably the manuscript of Comenius's *Didactica magna*.

He also found time to translate the "Liberated Jerusalem" of Torquato Tasso into Czech verse, and a selection of Schiller's ballads and poems, the latter being published at Breslau in two parts in 1840 and 1841. Purkyně not only had to teach the compositor some Czech, but had to help in composing with his own hands. In the Preface he confesses that he has not given up his early enthusiasm for poetry, and that he considers these translations as training for later original poetry. He did also some translating from Goethe at that time, but nothing that was published in book form. Here again we have not exhausted the account of Purkyně's activities outside his own special scientific field; but these few examples will give a picture of the character and the method of work pursued by the great scientist.

The year 1848 was important for the political development of Central Europe. It was also a turning-point for Purkyně. He came to Prague to attend the Slavonic Congress, and there his never extinguished desire to return to Prague broke out more strongly than ever. At last, in 1850, when there was a favourable situation in the Austrian Ministry of Education, his hope was fulfilled. And so he returned with his two sons (his two little daughters had died on one day) at the age of 63, to the city of his dreams. One of his sons was married to a German lady who spoke, however, excellent Czech though she had never lived in Bohemia. Both sons were Czechs by conviction, though their mother was the daughter of a professor of Berlin University. Prague had changed considerably since he left it. The majority of his contemporaries were dead, and a new generation had come to the fore, to whom he was almost unknown. Even the most brilliant politician and journalist of this generation (next to Palacký), Karel Havlíček, did not comprehend Purkyně's importance, and wrote in his paper in favour of another candidate for the vacant chair of physiology.

Purkyně remained undisturbed. He very quickly equipped a second Institute of Physiology, this time with smaller difficulties than in Breslau, for the fame which preceded him helped him to overcome obstacles. Here he gathered around himself most of the young Czech talent from medical circles, and he began to work on similar lines as at Breslau. Soon he founded a scientific periodical,

*Živa*, and began to lecture at the University of Prague in Czech, though his colleagues at that time lectured in German. Purkyně was one of those who advocated an increased use of Czech at the University, and he became a deputy in order to propagate these demands more collectively. But this campaign had no success in the first instance, though permission was at least granted for the examination for the doctorate of medicine to be held in Czech also. The main obstacles were the political reaction which at that time repressed all the efforts at emancipation among the non-German nations of the Austrian Empire, but also the apathy of the Czech physicians themselves, who thought then that so international a science as medicine could be cultivated only in the language of a big nation. But the seeds sown by Purkyně sprang up later, and a number of his pupils eventually became important Czech scientists, even though none of them can be compared with the master. He himself founded with them the "Review of Czech Physicians," which attracted a great deal of the general scientific activity of the Czech nation. He did not live to see a Czech Medical Faculty, but only 14 years after his death his pupils achieved what he had fought for in vain.

Purkyně's scientific zeal did not slacken even in his old age. His German biographers have ignored this last stage of his work, but a whole series of lectures given by him in various Prague societies exists to prove that he continued working right up to the end. Scientists from all over the world came to visit him in order to learn his methods of investigation. But it is true that much of his work was now devoted to his nation. He translated his most important works from German into Czech, and thereby helped to lay the foundations of Czech scientific terminology. His countrymen frequently did not understand the full importance of this work, and many of his writings were appreciated only in recent times. Moreover, he had interests and plans outside the sphere of science. He was one of the founders of the "Umělecká Beseda," a society of Czech artists, musicians, painters, etc. Purkyně was its first vice-president, and he founded a special scientific section for the study of the theory of the arts. Here again he was in advance of his surroundings. It took several decades before the full value of his work was recognised. Purkyně was also interested in Czech industrial schools, and he became the director of the first school of this type in Bohemia.

Purkyně had close relations with the "Museum of the Kingdom of Bohemia," and many of his pupils worked there. He also dreamt of a Bohemian Academy, conceived as "Bohemian" in the terri-

torial sense, comprising both Czechs and Germans from that area. He worked out a detailed plan which even today is admirable for its breadth of vision and modern spirit, and which contains a short essay entitled "Academy," which reminds us of Comenius.

He, of course, also took a part in politics, and only worked the harder when he lost the confidence of the electorate. For the times were bad. The "Ausgleich" of 1867 by which Austria was divided into Austria-Hungary and all hopes of the non-German and non-Magyar nations for a just settlement of their grievances were buried, inspired Purkyně to write his longest political article, "Austria Polyglotta," when he was 80. Purkyně was afraid of death in his childhood, but later he got "accustomed" to it owing to his frequent fainting fits. At that time he awaited it almost with "curiosity," to use his own words. He was not actually ill. He still carried on his work as professor of physiology, and warded off the youngsters who wanted to replace him. But death was a rare occasion for introspection. So rare indeed that most people go through it only once.

But the exciting political events carried even this giant off his feet. His pen wrote. His last words were addressed to his nation, and to those who endangered its very existence. But he did not write words of hate. "Only the spirit reconciles all opposites" was the motto of his swan-song. "A real politician of love," continues Purkyně, "never sides with this or that party, when a conflict arises between nations, but puts himself into their centre and above them, knowing that each one of these nations is right to a certain extent and he will try to meet both sides because he wants the happiness of both nations." A little further on he said: "It is not a question of a stronger nation dictating the law to other weaker ones, as it was with the Romans. The problem cannot be solved save by the establishment of a permanent congress of nations which would be considered inviolate and which had received the right and the power from the individual nations and governments, to decide their conflicts and even to bring them back to obedience by force, if necessity should demand." Though the political situation was serious, Purkyně was not afraid for the future of his nation. "One could scarcely find a nation which has proved its individuality so clearly as has the Czech nation from its first entry into the Bohemian basin until the present time. For centuries it had to struggle with powerful Germany. The states around Bohemia and even the Catholic Church rose against it, while it defended its national independence and the freedom of the human spirit, until it sank to a state of apparent death, from which it is only now beginning to awaken, in a period more favourable to



human liberty. We hope that it will be able to resist at least by spiritual force, if not by physical, to the stormy attacks of recent perverted policy, and that it will shine also in the field of science and art, though only a small nation in the midst of great ones."

Just as in his scientific discoveries, Purkyně was astonishingly modern also in his political views. Inspired as he was by love for the knowledge of nature, by love for his own nation, but also by love for every other nation, Purkyně did not get full recognition either at home or abroad. Only two years ago a German philosopher called Purkyně the greatest Czech of the 19th century: and to his own nation Purkyně, the humanist and philosopher, still remains in some respects to be discovered quite anew. Yet in his political opinions we find much in common between Purkyně and the greatest minds of his nation: George of Poděbrad, Comenius, Palacký, Masaryk.

In particular his *role* as philosopher is not fully appreciated to-day. His bold philosophical conceptions (too bold sometimes) puzzled the positivists and repel even today many people. But those who have studied Purkyně's philosophy, believe in his assertion that he waited impatiently for death in the last years of his life. Death was to him only a phase in evolution, only a metamorphosis of a particle of the unlimited and eternal, all-pervading spiritual essence which is ever creating new and more perfect forms of life and conquers ever wider spheres of matter, thus making possible an ever more perfect scientific knowledge. The belief in immortality, inculcated by his simple mother had developed into this doctrine which he expressed partly in the language of contemporary German philosophy.

But since spirit permeates and directs all matter, the laws of the spirit must be the same as those of matter. There cannot therefore be any difference between subjective and objective natural science. Both must arrive sooner or later at a recognition of the unity of events, both inside our minds and outside.

Jan Evangelista Purkyně died on 28 June, 1869, aged 82. He was buried in the Vyšehrad cemetery, where the Czech nation lays to rest its greatest men. A large crowd accompanied his coffin and many societies and corporations of the town were represented at the funeral, with the exception of the Medical Faculty which then was German. For they could not forget that the founder of German histology and experimental physiology had never ceased to be a Czech. But he was too mildly nationalistic for some Czechs. This is the usual fate of men who want to be above the parties during a struggle.

(Translated by René Wellek).

MIROSLAV KŘIVÝ.

## ENGLISH TRANSLATIONS OF EUGENE ONEGIN

*Professor Simmons deals with the four complete verse translations of Pushkin's classic into English which have appeared since his death—three of them in the year of his centenary :—ED.*

WITH the appearance in book form of Professor Oliver Elton's translation of *Eugene Onegin*, the time is perhaps ripe for an appraisal of the four complete versions of Pushkin's masterpiece that now exist in English.<sup>1</sup> In 1937 the celebration of the centenary of Pushkin's death in Soviet Russia was carried out on an unprecedented scale. No poet in the history of world literature has ever received such national homage from a devoted people. Nor have admirers in Western Europe and America been unresponsive to this auspicious occasion. In the form of translations, biographical studies, and critical articles a generous tribute has been paid by students of Pushkin outside of Russia. The reaction of critics, who do not read Russian, to these publications was almost uniform. They were reluctant to accept the oft-repeated assertion that Pushkin should be ranked along with, or even higher than, those giants of the Russian novel—Dostoyevsky, Turgenev, and Tolstoy—who had long since achieved world-wide fame. For the critics could see nothing in the translations of Pushkin that would justify his claim to such lofty literary eminence. And now, despite the availability of four translations of Pushkin's masterpiece into English, I must confess that the doubters still have an element of justice, whether or not it be poetic, on their side.

I find it hard to accept the criticism, based on the analogy of world-famous poets who have been successfully translated, that if Pushkin's poetry is as great as his apologists maintain, then this greatness should likewise manifest itself in a convincing way in foreign dress. Great poems of antiquity and of modern times were great in the originals to readers before they were great in translation. And our knowledge of the originals, in no small way, contributes to the pleasure we obtain from translated versions. Further, many notable poets have often had the good fortune to be translated by

<sup>1</sup> *Eugene Onéguine*, Translated by Lieut.-Col. T. Spalding (Macmillan and Co., London, 1881); *Eugene Onegin*, Translated by Babette Deutsch in *The Works of Alexander Pushkin*, Selected and Edited by Avrahm Yarmolinsky (Random House, New York, 1936); *Eugene Onegin*, Translated by Dorothea Prall Radin and George Z. Patrick (University of California Press, Berkeley, 1937); *Eugeny Onegin*, Translated by Oliver Elton, The Pushkin Press, London, 1937.

men of eminent poetic distinction in their own right. So far, no foreign poet with anything like Pushkin's ability, or with a mastery of the Russian language and a command of the special technique of the consummate translator has appeared to do full justice to his works.

It may also be argued that no matter how wretched a translation may be technically, if the original possesses universality of appeal in content and high seriousness of purpose, then these attributes of great art will inevitably stand out. This is a just stricture, but it demands some qualification in Pushkin's case. In no single work of his can one say that universality of appeal and high seriousness are sustained as they are in the masterpieces of Homer, Dante, Milton, or Goethe. The unusual versatility of Pushkin's genius, and perhaps his short life, made impossible such a sustained, major effort. But it would be a mistake to imagine that he did not possess these attributes of great poetry. For their fullest expression, however, one must seek high seriousness and universality of appeal in Pushkin's total production, not in any single work. This is not begging the question; it is simply a restatement of the position that Russian critics take when they claim for Pushkin a lofty place in world literature.

It is not necessary to itemise here the many difficulties which a translator of Pushkin has to face; they have been described on various occasions. The question is not one merely of form, of metre, rhyme, and the mechanical ordering of lines. The form of some poets is easy to duplicate. For example, in translation one can imitate with precision Pope's heroic couplets or the language of Byron's Eastern tales, *Childe Harold* or *Don Juan*. In these cases the form seems to be a dress, clothing the nakedness of content. But with Pushkin form is never a kind of dress or shell; it is the very soul of his poetic expression, a quintessential quality which Russian critics have described as "Pushkin's language." He handles the Russian language, in the words of Maurice Baring, "as a great orchestrator writes an orchestral score." And his phrase-making, his delicate word-selection, and the finer nuances of his verse harmony have never been successfully imitated, even by his Russian followers in poetry. The language of Pushkin is as unique, in a sense, as the language of Shakespeare.

Few competent translators have failed to recognise this supreme difficulty in rendering Pushkin. The task is comparable, let us say, to that of translating into Russian the metrical music and inimitable phraseology of Robert Herrick. Or, let us take a brief example from Russia's greatest translator, and from one of his most notable

renderings—Zhukovsky's version of the *Elegy Written in a Country Churchyard*. He translates the second stanza :

В туманном сумраке окрестность исчезает,  
 Повсюду тишина, повсюду мертвый сон ;  
 Лишь изредка, жужжа, вечерний жук мелькает,  
 Лишь слышится вдали рогов унылый звон.

Of course, the familiar accents of Gray's pentameter lines are unpleasantly submerged in Zhukovsky's alexandrines. But to my sense of the poetical fitness of things, much more hopeless seems the ravished beauty of Gray's impeccable phrasing of

Now fades the glimmering landscape on the sight,  
 And all the air a solemn stillness holds,

when turned into Russian, which literally translates back into English :

In the misty twilight the environs fade,  
 Far and near stillness ; far and near a deathlike sleep ;

And this conclusion is reached with the knowledge that, in the Russian, Zhukovsky's lines made perfectly good verse.

The four English translators of *Eugene Onegin* have frankly faced these several difficulties I have mentioned, as well as many others not commented on here, and they have solved them with varying degrees of success. To be sure, they have often made the matter too simple in some cases. It is not enough to pose the problem of translation as merely one of form and content, and then to decide to what extent you will sacrifice one for the other. There are other problems of equal weight. Pushkin is guilty of understatement in his dedication to Pletnev, where he rather lightly comments on his masterpiece as (Elton's translation) :

These pastimes of a careless mind,  
 Of wakeful hours, light inspirations,  
 Of years unripe, of years that wane,  
 Of cold, keen, reasoned observations,  
 And signals of a heart in pain.

The reader should not allow himself to be misled by this modest description. With some justification *Eugene Onegin* has been called an encyclopædia of Russian life. In the more than five thousand lines of the poem Pushkin has brought to life a definite period of Russian national existence with all the authenticity of the historical picture of *War and Peace*. A translator cannot afford to ignore this

fact; and the contents of the poem, as well as the historical, social, and cultural background that Pushkin drew upon, must be studied in detail. Otherwise the finer points of suggestiveness, implication, satire, and irony will be missed in the translation. Not a few of the lines, phrases, and single words contain problems of rendering which baffle even native Russians and require some investigation if the precise interpretation is to be achieved. In short, the considerable amount of commentary by native scholars on *Eugene Onegin* ought to be studied with great care by a translator, and this is not uniformly the case in the English versions.

There is still one more problem in connection with the rendering of *Eugene Onegin* that I should like to touch on briefly before I consider the English translations themselves. In his best lyrics Pushkin expresses with perfect felicity the fullest awareness of a given moment. The poems are all of a piece, metrically and emotionally. But in *Eugene Onegin* he combines two qualities that are rarely found together because, as a rule, they are mutually exclusive—the fire of creative imagination and the coldness of controlling reason. The presence of these two qualities in the poem very often involves what I may call a change of pace. The metrical unity is always observed, but within this larger framework Pushkin seems to allow the movement of his verse to reflect the emotional or intellectual mood he is trying to express at a given time. This subtle variation the translator must catch if he is to give some concrete suggestion of one of the chief poetic charms of *Eugene Onegin*.

Perhaps because it was the first, Spalding's translation is often set down as a pioneer version, which we naturally expect to have all the faults of an initial attempt. True enough, it has faults, but the remarkable fact is that it has not more. Although he eschewed the regular pattern of the difficult double rhymes, Spalding otherwise accepted the challenge of the involved stanza and sustained it reasonably well. But he was no poet, and despite his ability as a competent versifier, the exacting demands of the stanza forced him into a glaring number of bad rhymes, awkward inversions, and padded endings. What is particularly distressing is his complete failure even to suggest any of the poetic niceties in which the original abounds. This could happen only with a translator woefully lacking in literary taste. I have no doubt that some of these faults may be attributed to his obvious determination to be as literal as possible. And in this last respect he merits honest praise. Spalding obviously knew Russian well, and his rendering is unusually faithful. In general, he follows the original line by line, translating literally, and getting his rhymes

in as best he can. Finally, his notes indicate a fair understanding of the poem and its background, and succeeding translators have been indebted to his commentaries.

Metrically, the translation of Babette Deutsch represents a tremendous improvement over Spalding's version. The translator is a poet, and she brings to *Eugene Onegin* artistic sensibilities that her predecessor never possessed. The complicated metrical scheme of the original, with the difficult feminine rhymes, she faithfully adheres to throughout the whole translation. As poetry the rendering has felicity and verve.

One cannot expect such an exacting metrical form to be sustained in translating over five thousand lines without some violations of literalness. Between form and content compromises must be made, but one has a right to demand that the sense of the original be preserved with reasonable care. The most serious charge against Babette Deutsch's version is that the exact meaning of the lines is flagrantly violated time and again, and in many instances it does not seem that the smoother poetical effects achieved are a satisfactory compensation. The fault is not merely a question of separate stanzas, it runs through the whole version. Nor is it solely a matter of the almost justifiable addition of words in order to obtain the difficult double rhymes (as the insertion of *quick as monkeys* to rhyme with *flunkeys*, I, 22). But whole lines are added or left out, in one place a stanza is shortened, the order of lines is violated in an extreme degree, and in some instances the interpretation of the original is definitely missed.

These faults are too many to list and to comment on in detail. The total impression one obtains is that the translator did not make a serious study of *Eugene Onegin*, which in itself would have indicated the advisability of greater faithfulness to the meaning of the original. If a translator were turning a prose rendering of the original into verse, we should expect the results to resemble pretty closely the kind of paraphrasing in Babette Deutsch's translation.

At any rate, Babette Deutsch clearly placed the main emphasis upon form, and in this she has succeeded very well. In the light of her expert poetical effects in numerous stanzas, one can forgive her occasional lapses of taste, forced rhymes, and use of expletives. The subtle change of pace in the original, which I commented on above, is entirely lacking in this version. However, not a little of the swing of Pushkin's verse harmony has been caught by Babette Deutsch's sure poetic ear, and for this she deserves high praise.

The translation of Dorothea Prall Radin,<sup>2</sup> unlike the other versions, represents a notable attempt at a compromise with the exacting metrical form of the original in an effort to avoid some of the worst faults that arise from a rigid adherence to Pushkin's intricate stanza. And in several important respects I think the results justify her interesting experiment. I fully share Professor Elton's conviction that "to quit Pushkin's measure is really to quit the field." But it should be observed that Mrs. Radin does not quit the measure, she simply modifies the measure slightly in the hope of obviating the jingling effect that often results from the frequent rhyming of iambic tetrameter lines in English, and also because she believes that her variation will enable her to approach more nearly the characteristic flowing ease of Pushkin. She retains the fourteen-line stanza with the difference that the feminine endings of the first and third lines are not rhymed, and in the remaining lines the distinction between masculine and feminine endings is disregarded.

In my opinion, the chief gain in this partial escape from the tyranny of double rhymes in English is the unusual and praiseworthy literalness of Mrs. Radin's translation. Whereas Babette Deutsch appears to have concentrated her major efforts on the form, Mrs. Radin seems to have devoted herself to a careful rendering of Pushkin's meaning. There are not a few places, however, where I should quarrel with her deviations from the exact meaning of the original, but in general a faithful rendering is the chief value of this translation.

In the matter of sheer poetry, Mrs. Radin's freer stanza has enabled her to avoid very often the blemishes of forced rhymes, padding, and expletives. There are some very poor rhymes, such as *soon-alone* (III, 21), *back-neck* (V, 17), and altogether too many examples of those infelicitous rhymes between trisyllabic words and monosyllables (*finally-he*, *funeral-all*), but in the majority of such instances it is clear that she has deliberately sacrificed perfection in form to Pushkin's exact meaning. The simple quality of her diction has a good deal of the flavour of Pushkin's, specially in the conversational passages and in Tatyana's letter, which is admirably rendered. On the whole, the poetry of this version is not sustained, but it reaches splendid heights in separate stanzas and in descriptive passages. In general, where the contents of Pushkin's lines are

<sup>2</sup> Mrs. Radin worked directly from the original, although she was aided by a complete prose version by a Russian, Professor George Z. Patrick, a fact which she explains in her introduction.

packed with the indubitable stuff of poetry, Mrs. Radin is at her best, but in those passages where commonplace contents are elevated by the genius of "Pushkin's language," her renderings are apt to be pedestrian. However, these latter passages constitute the severest test for any translator, and I am convinced that only a poet of great distinction could carry them off successfully.

Pushkin loved beautiful books, and he would have been delighted with the handsome edition that contains Professor Elton's translation. With his own passion for drawing, one may imagine the pleasure Pushkin would have obtained from the charming illustrations of his masterpiece, executed by Mr. M. V. Dobuzhinsky. He did not live to see the wealth of talent Russian illustrators were to lavish on the *Eugene Onegin*. On one occasion he thought of employing the famous engraver F. P. Tolstoy, mentioned in the poem (IV, 30), to illustrate a collection of his verses, but he was obliged to abandon the idea because the price was prohibitive. In appearance certainly, no foreign version of *Eugene Onegin* is equal to Professor Elton's, and of the many editions of the poem in Russian with which I am acquainted, there is only one, the illustrated Soviet edition, edited by M. A. Tsyavlovsky, which bears comparison as an artistic piece of book-making. The Foreword by Desmond MacCarthy is marred by a few unqualified facts and downright errors, such as the statement that Pushkin was degraded from his position in the Guards at Petersburg (p. xv), an organisation to which he never belonged. But the neat Introduction of Professor Elton only makes us wish that space had permitted him to elaborate more fully the interesting points that he discusses in brief.

Professor Elton and Babette Deutsch have properly followed the text of 1837, the last edition that received Pushkin's own corrections, and also that accepted by the Soviet scholars, B. Tomashevsky and K. Halabayev. Spalding and Mrs. Radin have seen fit to include some of the stanzas ultimately rejected by Pushkin, stanzas which, I think, ought to be relegated to the notes of any modern version. Professor Elton has brought to the poem the scholarship for which he is noted, and his careful study of the text is reflected in the translation. Among others he has consulted the extensive Russian *Commentary* of N. V. Brodsky (which has been severely criticised by B. Tomashevsky), and the results of these investigations are evidenced in fine matters of interpretation and in his own notes. Pushkin's notes to his poem are far from being sufficient for the modern, and particularly, the foreign reader. There are innumerable points in the text which require explanation



and clarification. I think it a fault common to all the translations that not enough of this kind of annotation is appended. Mrs. Radin and Professor Elton go farthest in the direction of supplying this lack.

While frankly admitting that it is impossible to impart the "secret" of Pushkin's rhythm in translation, Professor Elton believes it essential to try to respect its formula. He duplicates the difficult form precisely, and more than this, with unusual skill he catches the characteristic flowing ease of Pushkin's measure and sometimes, I think, a bit of the "secret" of his language. There is real poetry in this translation. An extraordinary cosmopolitan, Pushkin assimilated the spirit of the literary languages of Western Europe in the early 19th century, and in subtle ways it affected his own literary vocabulary. Professor Elton's knowledge of the Western European literary language of the time has enabled him, in places, to impart to his rendering a kind of verbal verisimilitude that definitely enhances its charm as well as its authenticity.

Of course, despotic rhyme claims its inevitable sacrifices in this version as in all the others, although in nearly every case one feels that the sacrifice was deliberately made in order to achieve some sort of compensation. Too often the rhyme forces the placing of phrases or clauses in single lines between commas and thus interrupts the natural flow and makes for a certain jerkiness. The licence of enjambment, common enough in the original, seems to be applied too frequently in the translation. In English this device neutralises Pushkin's emphatic rhymes. For example, the rendering of the well-known fiftieth stanza in the first chapter loses much of its force and metrical emphasis because of the unnaturally broken, run-on lines. The other translators, however, are no more successful with this stanza. Inversions in Russian poetry, as is generally known, are natural enough, but their use in English verse, except when one is trying to be archaic, results in a deplorable artificiality. All the translators are forced into them because of the exigencies of rhyme. But some of the inversions of Professor Elton are serious blemishes in his otherwise smooth lines, as the long one in II, 3, or "Her you know" in VIII, 18.

On the whole, the rhymes of Professor Elton, both single and double, are remarkably pointed and well sustained, equal to the very efficient expertness of Babette Deutsch. What seem like lapses, such as *passion-desolation* (IV, 23), *come-tomb* (VI, 37), are scarcely worth chronicling.

There are a few small matters of diction and word-usage, the *pros* and *cons* of which Professor Elton is probably much more aware of than the average reader of his translation. The use of "dizened," instead of bedizened, for the "clothed" of the original (I, 4) is proper enough, but seems a little forced since this rare form is employed as a rhyme-word. I take exception to "golden pines" (I, 16) for the "golden pineapples" of the original. Babette Deutsch also translates the word "pines," whereas Spalding and Mrs. Radin insist on "pineapples." I have found that readers are baffled by the rendering "pines" "Now bedward from the ball he comes" (I, 35) seems like a distortion of the original "From the ball he goes to bed." Here again the rhyme has exacted its toll. And in this same stanza "chimney-ends" for "chimneys" in order to rhyme with "ascends" is a trifle forced. Then "unfriend" (I, 53) is a fetching but rather violent equivalent for "enemies," and in the same stanza the rhyming of "wasters sores," a translation for "waster" or "spendthrift," only emphasises the awkwardness of the expression. However, such picayune faults—and a few more could be added—stand out in this version only because they are rarities.

Indeed, Professor Elton makes a special virtue of accuracy in his translation and, where he departs from the exact meaning of the original, he appears to do so with a full awareness of the fact. Usually it is the demon rhyme that tempts him. I also take exception to his rendering of Pushkin's "imitative Knyazhnin" (I, 18) as Knyazhnin "that witty mime." Pushkin, I think, meant precisely "imitative," even "monkeyish" in a derogatory sense. Krylov's epithet for him was the "rhyme-stealer"—Knyazhnin was a slavish imitator. Spalding has exactly the right idea in translating the phrase "Kniajnine, apt at copying," whereas Babette Deutsch and Mrs. Radin seem to have missed the real implication in padding out the line. Not one of the translators has succeeded in rendering literally the last three lines of the thirty-fifth stanza in the first chapter. Pushkin's "And the baker, the accurate German, in his paper cap, more than once Has opened his *vasisdas*," is translated by Professor Elton:

And Germans, punctual at their baking,  
In paper caps, have now flung wide  
Their casements upon every side.

The exact picture that Pushkin conveys is lost. The other trans-

lators do no better, although Mrs. Radin wisely gives a literal rendering in her notes.

One could accumulate a few more such slight deviations from the original in Professor Elton's translation, and it would be interesting to comment on them and to compare them with the renderings in the other versions. But space will not permit this. His departures from the letter of the text are of little consequence, and it would be ingratitude to expect perfect literalness in a translation in which a complicated verse-form is so brilliantly sustained.

Professor Elton rises to every occasion in the famous passages—the rich descriptive stanzas in the first chapter, Tatyana's letter, the dream, the feast at the home of the Larins, and the duel. In a translation every student of Pushkin at once turns to the famous stanza which describes the ballet dancer Istomina (I, 20). This is the test of tests in metrical skill. There is a story that Count Miloradovich wished to have a poet celebrate the dancing of Istomina's successor as artistically as Pushkin immortalised his favourite. But the Count was always dissatisfied with the efforts of the poets, exclaiming: "No, she is not like that; the chief thing is как она ножкой-то об ножку бьет." The extraordinary picture of Istomina which Pushkin etched in this stanza and capped by the last two inimitable lines, to which the Count refers in the anecdote, where the poet by sense and sound perfectly catches the dancer in flight—all this was beyond the powers of his followers. Professor Elton has acquitted himself admirably, but I think that of all the English translators Mrs. Radin has best rendered this famous stanza and in this instance she fully justifies the greater freedom which her variation of the rhyme scheme permitted.

It would be instructive to continue this examination of the many jewels of poetry in *Eugene Onegin*, and to consider the manner in which the several translators have coped with them. However, one cannot go on indefinitely. No criticisms of these four versions can minimise the tremendous amount of effort that has gone into them. Nowadays, in the face of contemporary interests and the relative indifference of publishers to such attempts, any translation of a long poem, written in the early years of the 19th century, is bound to be a labour of love. These four translations of Pushkin's masterpiece, executed from various points of view, offer their own separate contributions to a fuller knowledge of the poem by readers who do not know Russian. And I regard Professor Elton's translation as a genuine and lasting addition to the series of great

translations which have become part of the noble heritage of English literature.

I am sure that no one of these translators feels that he has revealed in English the full glory of Pushkin's language and the ineffable harmony of his form. Until we have several generations of cultural English-speaking people brought up in the knowledge of Russian, as they are in French and German, the true genius and full stature of Pushkin as a great poet will never be fully appreciated among us. The best we can hope from these translations is that they will provoke us to welcome Professor Elton's modest comment on his own work: "Why do you read this? Get to Pushkin himself."

*Harvard University.*

ERNEST J. SIMMONS.

## OBITUARY

### FEDOR SHALYAPIN

IN Fedor Ivanovich Shalyapin the world has lost a unique artistic personality: unique because he was surely one of those rarely-endowed souls in whom drama and music met on equal terms. Fine as his voice was, one can, I think, remember even finer voices. Singers who moved stiffly and meaninglessly on the stage have thrilled us by their voices alone; grotesquely fat tenors whose arms moved like semaphones have been endowed with tones of melting quality, but never in the course of a long life do I remember a supreme vocalist who added to his musical abilities the art of the perfect protagonist.

Shalyapin was born on February 1, 1873, in the ancient Russian city of Kazan. His father was a peasant from the district of Vyatka, and from him probably Fedor Ivan'ich inherited his strongly racial type, his fine stature, his blue eyes and corn-coloured hair.

My earliest personal recollections of Shalyapin date from 1897, when he was only twenty-four years of age. I was working daily in the Imperial Library at St. Petersburg (Leningrad), in a room which communicated with the official apartment of the librarian, Vladimir Stasov. One day Stasov's door opened, and he came out accompanied by a young man for whom he unlocked a glass case containing some rare historical engravings; probably he was advising him as to details for the costume of Boris Godunov. Leaving his visitor absorbed in his investigation, Stasov crossed the room to me and said in low tones: "That is our coming genius, Fedor Shalyapin. Would you like to know him?" Thus I met the man destined to become the most illustrious singer of his day. What struck me most at the moment was his rather expressionless visage, pale and somewhat resembling a blank canvas, on which I was afterwards to see depicted the vivid image of many passions and personalities: the remorseful suffering of the conscience-stricken Boris Godunov; the cunning cruelty and frenzied grief of that strange monster, Ivan the Terrible, after he had taken the life of his own son in a fit of insane rage; the religious enthusiasm of Dositheus; the pathetic chivalry of Don Quixote, and the sly humour of Don Basilio. Shalyapin was one of those rare artists who lived his parts, and possessed wonderful skill in the art of life-like "make-up."

I do not think that at this early period of his career the singer spoke fluently in any foreign language. He and Stasov carried

on their discussion in Russian, while I strained eyes and ears to make out the gist of their conversation. He was exquisitely courteous, but he was obviously a little surprised to learn from Stasov that I was occupied at the moment in making a serious study of Russian opera. As I looked into the placid, almost moon-like countenance of the artist, I little realised that this meeting was to be the starting-point of a friendship which would endure for over forty years.

It is not generally realised in this country that Shalyapin did not immediately blossom forth in his own land as an operatic star. His early career was, on the contrary, beset with opposition and periods of neglect. The directors of the Imperial Opera Houses were slow in securing the services of the legitimate successor of the great bass, Osip Petrov, who had created the part of Susanin in *A Life for the Tsar*. The press showed itself severe to Shalyapin, especially the narrow-minded, conventional critic, Ivanov, who, in his paper the *Novoe Vremya* mercilessly condemned the young artist's impersonation of Ivan the Terrible in Rimsky-Korsakov's opera. In these press attacks he received much comfort from the support of the redoubtable Stasov, who persuaded him that the abuse of some of the critics was actually a compliment rather than a detriment to his eventual fame.

In Shalyapin's young days Italy was generally regarded as the Mecca of all singers, but as he grew in experience he was inclined to devalue Italy as an ideal school of vocal and dramatic art. His career actually began in 1896, when the wealthy patron of art, Mamontov, freed Shalyapin from his contract with the Imperial Opera Houses, where so far his great talents had not received their due value. He now became for three years the leading figure in Mamontov's private opera company, where he created the series of strikingly original parts in which he became famous a year or two later when engaged by the Maryinsky Theatre, St. Petersburg, and the Imperial Opera, Moscow. Abroad he made an immense success in Milan in the rôle of Boito's "Mefistofele," and equally in Massenet's "Don Quixote" at Monte Carlo and Brussels.

I went to Paris in 1908 to witness his triumph in a season of Russian opera at the Grand Opera with a Russian company under the management of Dyagilev. But nearly five years elapsed before London realised the greatness of his genius. I remember that we talked together in Paris of the possibility of his visiting us; and eventually in the season of 1913, through the enterprise and generosity of Sir Joseph Beecham, he made his first appearance with a Russian company, not at Covent Garden, but at Drury Lane.

He told me that he was glad to make his débüt in this famous old theatre, less fashionable than Covent Garden but connected with the names of so many great English actors. I saw a good deal of him during this stay in London. He would often come on a Sunday to see me in my little house at South Hampstead, immaculately tailored in the English style, and to my consternation would sit on the grimy stump of an old elm tree in my tiny patch of garden. There he would read aloud long extracts from Russian poetry and prose, while I sat at my sitting-room window listening to his beautiful sonorous tones. He frequently said to me, "if my singing voice fails, I shall still be able to be an actor." But it did not fail even to the last; it only became attenuated with overwork and ill-health. Its power and volume declined, but he could send a *planissimo* phrase to the furthest ends of a large concert-room, and it was not merely *l'art de dire*—he sang to the last. After 1913 Shalyapin returned many times to England, and I need not chronicle all his subsequent successes.

Our personal intercourse remained very happy to the end. In 1915 my daughter and I spent several weeks with Shalyapin and his family at his country estate on the Moscow-Vologda line, and I had an opportunity of seeing him in his home life. He could not quite give up the actor's habits and did not put in an appearance at the family board till late in the day. But he would sit out on a verandah attired in an exquisitely embroidered Chinese robe of green silk with his favourite black French bulldog "Bulka" by his side. From time to time he held conversation with his children, with passers-by, or with the innumerable dogs by whom he was worshipped. In the evening we all met for supper, after which Fedor Ivan'ich would go for long walks in the forests. Some evenings he collected the peasants in the garden and read aloud to them the latest war news from the newspapers. I have seen him do many acts of kindness to the poorest of his tenants, but on the principle of "Let not thy right hand know what thy left hand doeth," he kept his charity to himself. From this time onward he took to calling me "Babushka"—"Grannie," and his last letter to me began in this kindly and intimate way.

I met him, too, several times at Karlsbad, seeking health for more than one grave illness, for although physically he was a magnificent specimen of manhood, his strenuous life had been taking toll of his strength for several years before the end came in Paris on 12 April of this year. He died and his funeral rites were celebrated in the Russian Orthodox Church.

## COUNT LEON PININSKI

IN Count Leon Piniński, who died at his residence in the city of Lwów shortly before Easter at the age of 81, Poland lost one of the last eminent representatives of that distinguished old-world type of statesman who combined the cultivation of scholarly, artistic, and literary interests with his political activities.

Born in 1857 as the son of a cultured family of land-owning nobles, Count Piniński was intended by his parents to devote himself, besides the administration of his large estates, to that career of politician and administrator which, after the grant of provincial self-government, had been opened up for men of his class in Austrian Poland. Soon, however, he showed his intellectual inclinations by going more deeply into the study of law than was required for an active political career. Having supplemented his legal training by studies in foreign—especially German—Universities, he attracted attention in the world of learning by an elaborate two-volume treatise in German on an important problem of civil law. (*Der Tatbestand des Sachbesitzerwerbs nach gemeinem Recht*, Leipzig, I 1885, II 1888) and became in due time Professor of Roman Law in the University of Lwów. It was to scholarly work on legal history and on problems of contemporary codification that he liked to return, off and on, in his later years, and it was his professorial chair that he again occupied permanently in the last decades of his life. He reached the dignities of Rector and of honorary Professor Emeritus in his University, he was for many years one of the most respected members of the historical section of the Polish Academy at Cracow, and one of the last products of his pen was a brilliant article on the 1400th anniversary of Justinian's codification of Roman law (1935).

In the meantime, however, the best years of Piniński's mature manhood had had to be devoted to the tasks of the forum and not to those of the academic grove. From 1888 to 1898 he held a seat in the Austrian Parliament at Vienna, and from 1898 to 1903 he occupied the high position of Governor of the province of Galicia. In Austro-Polish politics, he belonged to the group of Cracow conservatives, then dominant among the Polish representation, and rich indeed in remarkable and gifted personalities; he was one of the leading representatives of that wing of the group which consisted of Podolian landowners and accordingly, as befits the inhabitants of an exposed border region, was marked by greater warmth of national feeling than the somewhat Olympian sages of the Cracow centre. To Piniński it was given, in the first year of the War, during the Russian



occupation of Lwów, to co-operate on very real and urgent problems of the welfare of the population with an equally eminent representative of the Russian sector of Poland, Constantine Skirmunt, who came to Lwów as a representative of the Russian Red Cross, and who was to become Foreign Minister in the new Poland, and afterwards her Ambassador in London. Piniński himself was past sixty when Poland regained her independence, and he preferred to devote his remaining years to university work and to his favourite studies in art, rather than to political or administrative activities.

Music and painting, poetry and philosophy had, since Piniński's young days, attracted his keen and subtle mind at least quite as much as the law or politics. Like the late Lord Balfour, whom indeed he resembled in his entire mental make-up, he was a distinguished connoisseur and critic in all domains of art. His lifelong love of music—manifested in a number of unpublished compositions—had no doubt matured in the atmosphere of Vienna, that most musical among Europe's capitals in his early years; and his very first piece of published work in Polish on a larger scale was an essay on modern opera with special reference to Wagner and his "Parsifal" (Lwów, 1883). As for painting, annual journeys to Italy and frequent visits to all the great galleries of Europe contributed to make Piniński one of the best judges of the art in latter-day Poland. This was shown not only by numerous public lectures and essays on the great masters of painting and their works, but above all by Piniński's unwearied activities as an art collector. A large fortune, administered in very strict and efficient fashion, enabled him to indulge in the luxury of choice purchases and to turn his terraced villa on the ridge overlooking the Jesuit Park at Lwów into an exquisite private museum; rich in minor masterpieces of all the great schools of modern Europe since the Renaissance, but especially in works of the great English portrait painters of the 18th century, whom Piniński admired with particular warmth and fine discrimination. Many of these paintings were presented, even in Piniński's lifetime, to the reborn Polish State; and the entire collection, in accordance with his wishes, will adorn the walls of the restored Royal Castle on the Wawel mound at Cracow, while the ample collection of etchings goes to the Ossoliński Library • at Lwów.

Busy with problems of art criticism as we find Piniński at almost every stage of his life, it was not to the great works of painting that he turned for the subjects of his major literary efforts. The themes of these were chosen from among those great

books of the world's literature which, through repeated reading, had given him much food for reflection. Most characteristic perhaps was the first choice of this kind: it was around the philosophical musings of a great man of action that Piniński, himself divided between the world of ideas and the world of life, wove a garland of his own meditations in a brief but thoughtful book entitled *Under the Impression of the "Cogitationes" of Marcus Aurelius* (1911). And it was to a great poet, like himself, enamoured of classic shapes of beauty in the plastic arts, that he turned for the healing power of calm of mind and harmony of judgment when, in the midst of the horrors of the World War, he published his study of *Goethe's Opinions on Italian Art* (1916). Again, it was the association of the judicious temper of the lawyer with the lofty speculations of the moral philosopher that prompted him to honour the 600th anniversary of the death of Dante by a slender volume of weighty observations on *Dante's Ethics in the Divine Comedy* (1922). But Piniński's *magnum opus* in this kind arose out of a lifetime's ever-repeated study of the most "myriad-minded" poet of them all: his two large volumes on *Shakespeare* (1924), elaborated from a long course of public lectures on the poet's works. The book occupies a unique position among Polish and, in fact, among European studies in Shakespeare. Based on solid erudition, yet free from the detail-mongering pedantry and the encyclopædic ambitions of the specialist, it records the mature verdicts and considerations of a man who comes to Shakespeare with the harvest of many years' experience of a life of action at his command. The views taken from such an angle necessarily come nearer to the essence of Shakespeare's insight into the problems of human nature and conduct than a scholar's most painstaking researches can succeed in doing; and if the opinions delivered are sometimes not devoid of an administrator's and a lawyer's resolute arbitrariness, they are all the more suggestive by calling the reader's own experience of life into play and provoking discussion with the author, even occasional opposition to him. Such opposition, when it arises, is never violent; because Piniński, writing his book at the ripe age of over sixty-five, observes a moderation of statement and maintains a balance of judgment which give his work a truly enviable calm, very far remote indeed from the hysterics of the fanatical advocates of this or that learned theory on Shakespeare and his art. The experience of active life which underlies the discussion of the characters and situations of Shakespeare's plays throughout the book, inevitably imparts to it a certain air of dis-

ship and a passionate psychological interest in all the vagaries of humanity. He began his life-work as a historian specialising in German literature: his first publications were in German, such as his brilliant identification of important 18th century criticisms written by Gerstenberg, his analysis of Immermann's *Merlin* and his splendid little monograph *Kleist's Guiskardproblem* (1912) which, for the first time, gave a sensible interpretation of Kleist's mysterious fragment and an extremely probable forecast of its continuation. In later years Fischer began to publish large books on German writers in Czech, a circumstance which prevented their proper recognition in Germany. The two books on Kleist (1912) and Nietzsche (1913) were surpassed by a two-volume monograph on Heinrich Heine (1926) which seems to me by far the best book on that author. Fischer retells Heine's life in the light of new evidence not uncritically to the failings of the man, and he gives a full analysis of his works which stresses the newness and boldness of the last phase of his poetry when Heine, on the verge of death, spoke his innermost soul free from romantic conventions. In recent years Fischer's interests turned more and more to Czech literature, and Czech literary history owes him a great debt especially for his work on Erben and Čelakovský. Papers and essays ranging over a great variety of subjects will be found collected in two volumes, *The Soul and the Word* and *The Word and the World*. Fischer's main interest in literature is psychological. I believe he would have been incapable of writing a systematic history of German literature: he was attracted rather by outstanding or mysterious personalities, he loved to delve into the ultimate connections of life and work, into the processes of poetic creation, or to analyse the technique of poetical form. When he did not write a monograph on a poet he wrote on psychological questions in literature, e.g. on the problem of synæthesia (the hearing of colours and the seeing of sounds), or the "double" in romantic literature, the dreams of poets, etc. A little booklet, called *Problems of Literary Psychology* (1917) is in many respects the most systematic exposition of this approach to literature in any language. Fischer had less understanding for the social bearings of literature or for philosophical thought in a more technical sense. But a little book on Germany and Belgium which was the fruit of his stay at Ghent, shows how sharply he saw the parallels and contrasts between Belgium and his own country in tracing early manifestations of Pangermanism directed towards the Flemings. This little sketch would be incomplete if we did not mention the inspiration of his lectures at the University of Prague,

and his work in educating a whole group of younger literary historians who feel a debt to him which cannot be expressed merely in terms of close discipleship.

But Fischer was not content with being simply a literary historian, however excellent. He was a poet of high ambition and great performance. Since 1911 a series of little volumes have come out under such divers titles as *The Earthly Kingdom*, *The Burning Bush*, *Summer*, *Circles*, *The Voices*, *The Guest*, etc., which express in cultivated language the struggle of a sensitive soul with his fate and his own divided mind. The early dependence on post-romantic diction gave way to a simpler and finer expression in late years, and the early problems of titanism and mental isolation were more and more replaced by poems which treated in poetic language the tortuous problems of a Czech Jew, who was equally loyal as Czech and as Jew, and simpler moods and wider questions of life and death. Fischer's poetry—though possibly not the greatest poetry—is a major contribution to Czech poetry before the great post-war break in tradition. It is certainly the most intimate expression of his private life and, besides, it was the best preparation for his work as a translator.

Without exaggeration it may be said that Fischer was the best translator in the whole of Czech literature. He combined a never-failing ingenuity and remarkable conscientiousness with a real sense of style which makes his translations read like original poetry. His main interests were German and his greatest achievement is the translation of Goethe's works in 15 volumes which he edited with the collaboration of some of his pupils (E. A. Saudek, V. Jiráť, etc.). His own contribution includes a translation of both parts of *Faust*, which supersedes the earlier translation by the poet Vrchlický, of the *Westöstlicher Divan*, and of a full selection of his ballads and poems. This main work of the translator was preceded by several selections from German poets, by Kleists's *Guiskard* and *Penthesilea*, by Nietzsche's *Zarathustra* in rhythmic prose, by a selection from Heine's Poems and from Angelus Silesius. Fischer's translations were not confined to German literature, however. He had an intense interest in Shakespeare, and his translation of *Macbeth*, concise, balladesque, truly poetical, is probably still the best translation from Shakespeare into Czech. Besides, he translated Marlowe's *Edward II* and Shelley's *Cenci*, and most recently a small selection from Kipling's verse. French literature is represented by Corneille's *Polyeucte*, Verhaeren, and an extremely successful rendering of Villon, Russian, by the dramas of Pushkin. Fischer by his trans-

lations not only gave models of the translator's difficult art, but he raised its general standard by inspiring a number of pupils (of whom the most talented is E. A. Saudek) with the same devotion to accuracy and liveliness.

Fischer had also a passionate interest in everything connected with the theatre. He wrote dramatic criticism all his life (a collection *Towards Drama* (1919) is well worth reading), he became a reader of the Czech National Theatre for a time before the war and he returned to his love, when he took over the directorship of the National Theatre in 1935. One has the impression that he could not overcome all the difficulties of managing actors and actresses, and that the organising and administrative effort required was beyond and also below the powers of a man whose bustling activity disguised a highly sensitive soul. Fischer also attempted to write tragedies and comedies himself, and though they show his great abilities, they do not overcome an impression of effort and study. A boldly conceived drama on *Spartacus* remains a vivid memory in my mind, though I cannot suppress a feeling of wasted effort in his several attempts to revive the poetic drama.

Even though Otokar Fischer was suddenly cut off at a comparatively early age, this little survey, which is far from exhaustive, has shown that he had already completed a great and varied life-work. It is not merely a monument of what a lucky combination of scholarship and poetry can achieve, but also a living inspiration to his pupils in literary history, translating and theatrical criticism.

RENÉ WELLEK.

### LADY MURIEL PAGET

LADY MURIEL PAGET, whose life of grace and of good works is now cut short, had given herself since 1917 to the well-being of the Russian people and of the British in Russia. With Lady Sybil Grey she was the organiser of the Anglo-Russian Hospital in the War. With its base in Petrograd it maintained a field-unit at the very front in the Wooded Carpathians and, apart from the eminence of its surgeons, is was well known for the abundance and excellence of the equipment which it distributed to the troops.

Lady Muriel, who had simple and perfect courage, passed with a smile through the rough and tumble of the Revolution, completely disregarding all dangers and inconveniences. It was she who brought the organiser of the famous Czech Legions, Professor Thomas Masaryk, through Siberia out of Russia, and all these adventures were always a happy memory to her.

In the same happy and fearless way she was able to establish her foothold in the new Russia, where she now devoted herself to the care of those British subjects who were too old and infirm to leave the country, many of whom did not even know English; and in the rush of revolution which has gone on to this day, it was only her zeal for them that could prolong their existence.

She was herself like a Russian in her unfailing good nature and the charm of her simple friendliness; and it is a lasting service to this country that in her person the best of England should have been able to keep contact with Russia through all these troubled years.

BERNARD PARES.

## SOVIET LEGISLATION

*Decree of the Council of People's Commissars of the USSR and the Central Committee of the All-Union Communist (Bolshevik) Party.*

### **On Prohibiting the Expulsion of Members from the Collective Farms (Kolhozy).**

The C.P.C. of the USSR and the C.C. of the A.-U. C.(B.)P. have more than once warned the local Party and Soviet organisations of the harm arising out of the mass expulsion of members from the kolhozy. The C.P.C. of the USSR and the C.C. of the A.-U.C.(B.)P. have more than once pointed out the anti-Party and anti-State nature of such a practice. Notwithstanding this, cases of the unjustified expulsion of members from the kolhozy have occurred in many districts. Deviations and distortions in the expulsion of members from the kolhozy are particularly widespread in the Sverdlovsk, Novosibirsk, Smolensk, Kamenets-Podolsk and Zhitomir regions, the Altay, Krasnodar and Ordzhonikidze territories and the Kazakh SSR. The C.P.C. of the USSR and the C.C. of the A.-U.C.(B.)P. emphasise that the pernicious practice of expulsion from the kolhozy is to be also found in other districts.

This practice proves that the administrative boards and chairmen of the kolhozy, instead of upholding the Statutes of Agricultural Artels and preventing arbitrary treatment of members, are themselves the perpetrators of illegal actions. It has been verified that in an overwhelming majority of cases the expulsions are totally unjustified and are carried out without any serious cause under the most insignificant pretexts. The most widespread form of expulsion from the kolhozy is that involving the families of men who have left for temporary or permanent employment in State concerns. Such expulsions from the kolhozy on family grounds are in direct contradiction to the Statute of Agricultural Artels.

Prior to authorising an expulsion from a kolhoz, the Statute of Agricultural Artels provides for a series of intermediary preventive measures of an educational character to be applied to members of a kolhoz who transgress the internal order of the kolhoz, such as compulsory repetition of a badly-performed task without addition of labour-day units, warning, reprimand, censure at a general meeting, posting on the black-list, fine up to five labour-day units, transference to lower-grade work, temporary suspension from work. The kolhoz boards do not, however, for some reason, have recourse to these measures, and frequently expel members from the kolhozy for a simple transgression of the internal regulations of the kolhoz.

The Statute of Agricultural Artels provides that expulsion from an artel may take place only upon the decision of a general meeting of members of the artel with a compulsory attendance of no less than two-thirds of their total number. In practice, however, this basic rule is continually violated, and cases are frequent when members are expelled by order of the board of the kolhoz or even by that of the chairman alone.

Instead of restraining and rectifying this harmful practice of expulsion from the kolhozy, the leading regional Party and Soviet workers take no decisive steps to stop these abuses with regard to members of the kolhozy, maintain a bureaucratic and soulless indifference towards the fate of the members and their appeals against their expulsion from the kolhozy, and limit their entire activities to a mere registration of the fact of expulsion of members from the kolhozy and to the transmission to higher Soviet organs of statistical data concerning these questions. Furthermore, these workers themselves frequently urge the chairmen and boards of the kolhozy to illegal acts of expulsion from the kolhozy under the pretext of purging the kolhozy of socially-alien and class-antagonistic elements.

The C.P.C. of the USSR and the C.C. of the A.-U.C.(B.)P. consider that this practice is due to the formal and soulless bureaucratic attitude of many leading kolhoz workers and also Party and Soviet regional leaders towards the fate of human beings, the fate of individual kolhoz members. Such leaders do not realise that the expulsion of a member from a kolhoz deprives him of the means of livelihood, and not only means his humiliation in public opinion but also condemns him to starvation. They do not realise that expulsion from a kolhoz artificially breeds discontent and resentment among the expelled members and engenders an uncertainty regarding their position in the kolhoz among members generally, which state of affairs cannot but play into the hands of the enemies of the people.

The C.P.C. of the USSR and the C.C. of the A.-U.C. (B.)P. resolve :

1. To prohibit purges of the kolhozy on any grounds whatsoever.
2. To prohibit the expulsion from the kolhozy of members of the families of kolhoz members because one member of the family has left the kolhoz for temporary or permanent employment in a State concern.
3. To prohibit expulsion from the kolhozy for infringements of internal regulations.

4. To provide that henceforth expulsions of members from the kolhozy be adopted as an extreme measure towards obviously incorrigible members who undermine and disorganise the kolhoz, and this only after all preventive and educational measures provided by the Statute of Agricultural ArteIs have been exhausted, and in strict conformity with the procedure of expulsion as laid down by this Statute, i.e. upon the decision of a general meeting of the members of the artel at which no less than two-thirds of their total are present.

Nevertheless, even in such cases, every consideration must be given to the appeals of the members expelled.

5. To provide that the decision of a general meeting of members of the kolhoz concerning the expulsion of a member does not enter into force, and that the said member retains all his rights of membership, until the final examination of the said decision by the local district executive committee.

6. To warn the chairmen and members of the kolhoz administrative boards, and also the district Party and Soviet workers, that those guilty of an infringement of the present decree will be liable to prosecution on criminal charges.

Signed :

President of the Council of People's Commissars of the USSR.

V. MOLOTOV.

Secretary of the Central Committee of the All-Union Communist (Bolshevik) Party.

J. STALIN.

19 April, 1938.

(*Izvestia*, 20 April, 1938, No. 92 (6559).)

*Decree of the Council of People's Commissars of the USSR and of the Central Committee of the All-Union Communist (Bolshevik) Party.*

### **On the Incorrect Distribution of Revenues in Collective Farms (Kolhozy).**

The Council of People's Commissars of the USSR and the C.C. of the A.-U.C.(B.)P. note, as a result of the complete triumph of the collective farm system and an increased crop-yield, the considerable growth both in the general revenue in the kolhozy and in the individual income on the labour-day basis of their members.

Simultaneously, on the evidence of numerous cases, the Council of People's Commissars of the USSR and the C.C. of the A.-U.C.(B.)P. note that in the kolhozy of a number of regions, territories and republics, monetary revenues are incorrectly distributed, in direct contradiction to the policy of the Government and Party and to the detriment of the members of the kolhozy. The kolhoz administrative boards, with the direct connivance of the Party and Soviet organisations of the districts, regions, territories and republics, utilise the main part of the revenues for the erection of public buildings in the kolhozy and production and administrative expenses, in consequence of which the



part of the cash revenues allocated to members per labour-day unit is minimised, with the result that the members are frequently impelled to seek cash earnings outside the kolhozy, and the kolhozy themselves suffer from a shortage of labour.

For instance, in the Tatar ASSR in 172 kolhozy an average of only 28 per cent. of the revenue was allocated to the labour-day account, and in the Gorky region in 1,279 kolhozy only 33 per cent. of the monetary income of the kolhozy was allocated to this account. In several regions and republics (the regions of Rostov, Voronezh and Ryazan, the Kazakh SSR and elsewhere) there are kolhozy in which the monetary revenues for 1937 were not allocated to the labour-day account at all.

The Council of People's Commissars of the USSR and the C.C. of the A.-U C (B.)P. are in possession of a considerable body of evidence concerning a similar state of affairs in a whole number of other regions, territories and republics.

Instead of directing constant care towards increasing the labour-day earnings of members and co-ordinating the personal interests of members with those of the kolhoz as a whole, the kolhoz administrative boards have been carried away by the idea of capital construction and extravagant production and administrative expenditure. Not only has the percentage of deductions for reserve funds and for administrative, economic and cultural expenses not been reduced, it is on the contrary considerably in excess of the level fixed by the Statute of Agricultural Artels.

The Statute of Agricultural Artels provides that the kolhoz administrative boards may spend only such sums and on such items as were specified in the budget estimates approved by a general meeting of members. In practice, however, many kolhoz boards not only draw up budget estimates with an inflated expenditure, but also completely ignore the already approved budget, and without referring to a general meeting of members arbitrarily transfer sums from one item to another and spend money without any co-ordination of the expenditure with the revenue-plan. Such chairmen of the kolhoz boards forget that they have no right to alter the approved budget on their own initiative or to make this or that payment without the consent of members; they forget that they are wholly responsible to the general meeting of the kolhoz. The auditing commissions are as a rule either inactive, or else degenerate into an ancillary appendix of the administrative board for the purpose of providing a purely formal report on the annual balance-sheet.

The Statute of Agricultural Artels provides that all work within the kolhozy shall be performed by members, and only in exceptional cases is temporary outside hired labour permitted. In practice, however, cases are not rare when, owing to bad labour organisation, the kolhoz boards spend considerable sums in money and kind on hiring labour from outside, which leads to the squandering of kolhoz means and the lowering of kolhoz revenues.

Instead of care for the proper utilisation, storage and collecting of kolhoz produce for the purpose of augmenting the monetary income of the kolhoz, the boards of certain kolhozy frequently follow all the year round the practice, condemned by the Party, of squandering kolhoz produce by distributing it at low prices or gratis both within and outside the kolhoz. The storage of produce is inefficiently organised, which results in its mass deterioration, and consequently leads in such kolhozy to a low cash premium for members.

Leaders of the regional, territorial, republic and district Party and Soviet organs, instead of cutting short such violations of the Statute of Agricultural Artels and of the private interests of the members, actually encourage this anti-kolhoz policy. Party and Soviet workers in the regions, territories and republics fail to realise themselves, and to explain to the members of the kolhozy, that the considerable rise in kolhoz revenues and the consolidation of their public funds in the shape of buildings, live-stock and machinery (through the services of the machine and tractor stations) have made it possible to reduce the deductions from kolhoz revenues for public funds and capital and running expenses, and to allot the bulk of the kolhoz monetary income for distribution among the members on the labour-day basis.

The Party and Soviet leaders in the regions, territories and republics forget that such negligence with respect to the task of raising the value of the labour-day unit, with respect to the squandering and pilfering of kolhoz means, is an anti-kolhoz and wrecking practice.

It is the duty of our Party and Soviet leaders to remember that in a number of localities this policy of an artificial inflation of capital and running costs in the kolhozy and the lowering of the monetary income allocated on the labour-day basis is being consciously pursued by the enemies of the people for purposes of provocation and undermining the kolhozy.

The Council of People's Commissars of the USSR and the Central Committee of the A.-U.C.(B.)P. resolve :

1. To condemn, as anti-kolhoz, negligence with respect to the value of the labour-day unit of the kolhoz members and the squandering of kolhoz revenues on excessive capital, production, administrative and economic expenditure, and to compel the regional and territorial executive committees and the central committees of the national Communist Parties definitely to abandon such practices.

2. To repeal the existing system of allocation of the monetary revenue of the artels as laid down in the Statute of Agricultural Artels, and to establish that the artel shall henceforth divide among its members on the labour-day basis not less than 60-70 per cent. of the total monetary income of the artel.

3. To provide that deductions for capital expenditure may not exceed 10 per cent. of the monetary revenues, the sums for the capital expenditure of the current year to be deducted from the revenue of the previous year.

4. To provide that, out of sums in the budget estimates allocated by a general meeting of kolhoz members for production expenses, not more than 70 per cent. may be spent before the final estimate of the prospective crop-yield is established; the remaining 30 per cent. to be kept in reserve and utilised only after the prospective crop-yield estimate, and after a decision to that effect by a general meeting of kolhoz members.

In conformity with the above, Article 12 of the Statute of Agricultural Artels is to be amended as follows :

“ 12. Out of the monetary revenues obtained by the artel, the artel .

(a) pays the State the taxes fixed by law and all insurance rates ;

(b) divides among members on the labour-day basis not less than 70 per cent. of the monetary income of the artel ;

(c) makes the necessary payments for current production needs, such as current repairs of agricultural implements, treatment of live-stock, combating insect and other pests, etc. ;

(d) meets the administrative and economic expenses of the artel, assigning for that purpose not more than 2 per cent. of the monetary revenues ;

(e) allocates funds for cultural needs, such as the training of brigadiers and other cadres, the organisation of crèches, wireless, etc. ;

(f) pays into the reserve fund of the artel sums required in the coming year for the purchase of agricultural implements and live-stock, payment for building materials, wages to outside labour (builders), instalment payments to the agricultural bank on long-term credits ; the said deduction for the reserve fund not to exceed 10 per cent. of the monetary revenues of the artel.

All revenue items must be entered without fail to the credit of the artel not later than the day of their receipt.

An annual budget estimate must be drawn up both for revenue and expenditure, to enter into force only after ratification by a general meeting of the artel.

The administrative board is entitled only to such expenses as are included in the budget estimates, arbitrary transfer of sums from one item to another of the expenditure-estimates is prohibited, and for any such transfer the board must apply to a general meeting for permission.

Out of the annual expenditure-estimates for the production needs of the kolhoz, as approved by a general meeting of kolhoz members, the board cannot spend more than 70 per cent. of the estimated sums before the final estimate of the prospective crop-yield. The remaining 30 per cent. is kept in reserve, and may be utilised only after the prospective crop-yield is finally established and with the approval of a general meeting of kolhoz members.

All liquid currency belonging to the artel is kept on the artel's current account in a bank or savings bank. Sums may be debited from the current account only by order of the board of the artel, which is valid when bearing the signatures of the chairman and accountant of the artel.”

5. To establish the procedure by which the estimates of each kolhoz, after their approval by the general meeting, are laid for consideration before the presidium of the district executive committee, which examines the said estimates in the presence of the chairman of the board and the chairman of the auditing commission of the kolhoz in question.

6. To provide that the hire of outside labour for the kolhoz in exceptional cases, as stipulated in the Statute of Agricultural Artels, may be undertaken only with the consent of a general meeting of kolhoz members. To compel the secretaries of the A.-U.C.(B.)P. district committees and chairmen of the district executive committees not to tolerate abuses and infringements of Article 13 of the Statute of Agricultural Artels prohibiting the employment of the hired labour of non-members of the kolhoz except in cases stipulated by the said article.

7. To compel the regional and territorial committees and the central committees of the national Communist Parties to re-institute the work of the auditing commissions in all the kolhozy, so that all auditing commissions shall carry on their verification throughout the year, as laid down by the Statute of Agricultural Artels, and not limit it to a mere formal report to the board at the end of the year.

8. To provide that the branches of the State and Agricultural Banks shall pay out credits to the kolhozy only in cases where a resolution to that effect has been passed by a general meeting of kolhoz members.

9. To make it obligatory for the regional and territorial committees, the central committees of the national Communist Parties, the regional and territorial executive committees, the Councils of People's Commissars of the Republics, and also the public prosecutors, to open criminal proceedings against all persons guilty of illegal expenditure of kolhoz funds in violation of the Statute of Agricultural Artels and to the detriment of the kolhoz members, and to treat such acts as treason against the kolhoz cause and as help to the enemies of the people.

Signed :

President of the Council of People's Commissars of the USSR.

V. MOLOTOV.

Secretary of the Central Committee of the A.-U.C.(B.)P.

J. STALIN.

19 April, 1938.

(*Izvestia*, 20 April 1938, No. 92 (6559).)

*Decree of the Council of People's Commissars of the USSR and the Central Committee of the All-Union Communist (Bolshevik) Party.*

### **On Taxes and Other Liabilities of Individual Holdings.**

On the evidence of numerous cases the C.P.C. of the USSR and the C.C. of the A.-U.C.(B.)P. have established that the Party and Soviet organs in the republics, territories and regions are violating the policy and decrees of the Government and Party with regard to individual landholders. The liabilities to the State of the individual landholder in respect of taxes and the delivery of grain and meat have been determined

by Soviet laws. Nevertheless, instead of guaranteeing the fulfilment by individual landholders of the liabilities determined by law, local Party and Soviet organs tolerate conditions in which individual holders practically escape from fulfilling the said liabilities. In a number of regions and territories individual holders are not called upon to deliver meat, and the fulfilment of the district quotas for meat delivery is laid upon the collective farms. Thus the individual holdings are in fact placed by Soviet and Party organisations in a privileged position as compared with the collective farms, which is in direct contradiction to the existing laws.

Horses belonging to private holdings, not subjected to taxation, are regularly employed by private holders not on farm work on the holding but as a means of speculation and profiteering.

Kolhoz administrative boards, with the connivance of the district Soviet and Party organs and in contravention of the Statute of Agricultural Artels, constantly engage private holders for work in the kolhozy at a higher rate of pay than that due to the members of the kolhoz on the labour-day basis, which cannot but undermine discipline in the kolhozy. Such an incorrect attitude towards individual holdings results in direct harm being done to the task of drawing more individual holdings into the kolhozy.

All this testifies to the presence of numerous misconceptions on the part of Soviet and Party organs in the republics, territories and regions in their attitude towards the individual holder.

The C.P.C. of the USSR and the C.C. of the A.-U.C.(B.)P. resolve :

1. To compel the C.C. of the national Communist Parties, the territorial and regional committees, the Councils of People's Commissars of the Republics and the territorial and regional executive committees to cease their anti-state and anti-kolhoz practice of indulging private holders, and to see to it that individual holders carry out their liabilities in respect of taxes, deliveries of grain and meat, etc.

2. To re-introduce as from 25 April 1938 the state tax on horses belonging to individual holdings.

3. To compel the Soviet and Party organisations in the republics, territories and regions not to permit henceforth any evasion by individual holders of the fulfilment of any local *levées* (road-mending, timber-haulage, work for schools and hospitals, etc.), thereby tolerating no privileges whatsoever for individual holders as compared with members of the kolhozy.

Signed :

President of the Council of People's Commissars of the USSR.

V. MOLOTOV.

Secretary of the Central Committee of the A.-U.C.(B.)P.

J. STALIN.

19 April, 1938.

(*Izvestia*, 20 April 1938, No. 92 (6559).)

## THE CHRONICLE

### *Proposed International Conference*

Following Hitler's annexation of Austria, Litvinov presented a statement to the British, French, Czechoslovak and American Governments suggesting immediate consultation in an international conference as to practical measures necessary to stop future aggression and avert the danger of a new world war.

### *Elections to the Party and Republican Orders.*

A decree of 29 March called for new elections to all Communist Party organs, from the lowest unit to the highest, during the period April to 15 June 1938. Elections to the Supreme Council of the RSFSR were to be held on 26 June 1938; similar elections in the other autonomous republics to take place on 24 June. The indications are that these elections will proceed in the same manner as the election of 12 December 1937 to the Supreme Council of the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics, that is, the only candidate in each voting district will be the one presented by the "Block of Communists and Non-Party."

### *May Day, 1938*

The First of May Manifesto of the Communist International, addressed to the proletariat of all nations, consists largely of a review of the present world situation, where "a quarter of mankind is once more in the grip of war." Responsible for this is held to be the unwillingness of conservative elements in the democratic countries to co-operate in the enforcement of peace; the world proletariat must unite against fascism.

In Moscow the day was celebrated as usual, with a colossal parade numbering 1,505,000. For the first two hours it was a military review, with representatives of all armed and mechanised units participating. Workers' delegations then marched past the tribune, where among other foreign delegations, that from Spain was given a place of honour.

A special feature of the day was the arrival of the first steamer by the new Moscow-Volga canal.

### *Science and Culture.*

The Polar drift party, consisting of Papanin, Shirshov, Krenkel and Federov, reached Moscow on 18 March. Decrees of the 22nd awarded the Order of Lenin to them, and also to the four captains and the pilot of the vessels which rescued them, with less distinguished awards to all members of the crews. A permanent exhibit of the drift equipment has been set up in Moscow. Following their return, attention has been centred on the exploring vessels of the Arctic Administration which are icebound on the Northern coast of Siberia, some of them in perilous condition. On 10 May the icebreaker *Ermak* set out from Leningrad to aid three of these vessels, *Ruzanov*, *Proletarii* and *Rochol*.

The Azerbaidzhan State Opera conducted a highly successful season in Moscow in early April. While thus giving prominence to the culture of national minorities, the Soviets have sought this year to strengthen common ties by increasing the teaching of the Russian language in the schools of autonomous republics and districts. Significant events in Russian history have been commemorated, with suitable articles in the press. These include the Baptism of Russia, in 988, under Vladimir, the "Battle on the Ice," when Alexander Nevsky fought with the Swedes, the epic national and religious poem "The Tale of the Host of Igor," dating from 1288, and the military heroes of the Russian Empire, Suvorov and Kutuzov. Stanislavsky, founder of the Moscow Art Theatre, was fêted on his 75th birthday.

Soviet universities still lack text-books on modern history. In 1937 the State publishers issued a new edition of the eight-volume history of the 19th century by the French authors, Lavissee and Rambaud. The original French edition appeared at the end of the last century. This Soviet edition of 1937 has now been condemned, after only a year of existence, and a new revised edition will appear between 15 August and 1 November 1938.

#### *Jewish Colony in Birobidzhan.*

Soviet papers of the 8 May note the tenth anniversary of the special designation of Birobidzhan, in Far Eastern Siberia, as a Jewish Autonomous Territory. About 20,000 Jews have settled there during this period. Since the territory contains about 60,000 non-Jews, the administrative, economic and educational units are not exclusively Jewish.

#### *Religion.*

During the winter the antireligious forces have been strengthened along two lines : (1) The Union of Militant Godless has gone through a purge and its forces are strengthened with fresh personnel and money for antireligious propaganda. (2) The Communist Party has recognised the relative ineffectiveness of the "voluntary" Union of Militant Godless, and has therefore itself begun to take up the matter.

In the revived newspaper (thrice a month) *The Godless* a more serious and less offensive policy is followed. The arguments against religion are summarised in the editorial article for the first number, as follows :—

Religion promises an ephemeral, imaginary happiness beyond the grave, in a non-existent paradise.

Religion disunites people.

Religion lowers man.

Religion teaches that all depends on the will of a non-existent God.

Religion sanctifies the inequality of women.

The Party participation in antireligious effort began to take more definite form in connection with the general elections of 1937. The September Plenum of the Moscow City Party organisation set up short-

term courses in each city district for the training of antireligious propagandists. Stetsky, one of the national figures in the Party, who has hitherto played no part in the Godless Movement, was appointed to give proper direction to the purge. All over the Soviet Union the Party has taken the lead, instead of the Godless Union. Reports indicate that this action has the expected results of much speaking with little enthusiasm, a great number of undertakings existing on paper only.

The Church itself has been severely attacked through its bishops and priests. No one can tell how many have recently been arrested, but the number reported in the press, covering cases in Siberia as well as different parts of Russia, runs up to nearly a hundred. Nor can we judge of the validity of charges. A sinister case is that of the Metropolitan of the "Living Church" Platonov of Leningrad, who abjured the faith and became an atheist lecturer at just the time when other bishops were being arrested and "liquidated" on charges that seem fantastic.

Easter fell this year on 24 April and was celebrated with little disturbance. This reflects a consistent policy of emphasising antireligious propaganda and striking at the "top layer" of believers through demonstrative arrests, while allowing the faithful relative freedom.

#### *The Industrial Plan for 1938.*

Whereas in previous years the Economic Plan was always issued as a complete document by the Presidium of the Executive Committee of USSR, no such final document for 1938 has yet appeared. For industry, the only indications of a plan are contained in certain orders issued by the Commissary of Heavy Industry. This absence of a complete plan is explained by the present reorganisation of planning agencies and extensive changes in administrative personnel during the recent purges. Another reason is the recurrent reconsideration of the whole industrial policy hitherto in effect. A significant article by the new president of the State Planning Commission, Vosnesensky, maintains that much of the previous economic planning was unwisely done, owing to the influence of "wreckers" and other enemies of the people who participated in the planning commissions. Among these basic errors Vosnesensky cites a large number of "giant" projects, whose realisation strained the whole economic fabric, and froze large amounts of capital in construction, and the institution of unique projects, so located that their products have had to be transported too great distances for efficiency. Certain industries are badly placed, geographically, causing needless transportation, such as that of cement from European Russia to Eastern Siberia. Another mistake has been lack of proportion in different sections of a given industry. Not enough tyre-factories have been created to supply the automobile and tractor industry: there is disproportion between the spinning and weaving sections of textile manufacture, and between boiler and turbine-building. The plan for 1938 is to eliminate such errors. Such figures as are already available indicate either very small



advances over 1937, or, in some cases, even lower production. The following table compares the 1938 plan with actual production in 1936 and with the 1937 plan (complete actual figures are not yet available) :—

		1936 (actual product)	1937 (Plan)	1938 (Plan)
Electric power				
(Billion kilowatt hours)	..	33·0	40·5	41·2
Coal (million tons)	..	126·0	150·1	143·2
Oil	..	29·2	34·5	33·5
Cast iron	..	14·4	16·0	16·2
Steel	..	16·3	20·1	20·3
Rolled steel	..	12·4	15·6	15·1

The restraint evident in the 1938 plans is further explained by a study of the budget for industry, where large sums are assigned for the repair of apparatus overworked and outworn during the first two five-year plans.

At the beginning of May a meeting of the "active workers" of heavy industry summoned by this commissariat and attended by 700 persons listened to speeches urging, for the second quarter, production sufficient not only to fulfil the plan for this quarter, but to make up the deficiencies of the first three months.

#### *Soviet Foreign Trade in 1937.*

The total value of Soviet foreign trade in 1937 was 3,069·9 million roubles, an increase of 13·2 per cent. over the figure for 1936, which was 2,711·6 million roubles. Of the 1937 figure 1,728·6 million roubles represent export, and 1,341·3, import, giving an active trade balance of 387·3 million roubles. One notable feature of 1937 was the increased export of agricultural products: in 1936 these formed 20·3 per cent. of the total export, while they were 31·7 per cent. in 1937. This difference is largely accounted for by the increase of grain exports (35·9 million roubles in 1936, 257·6 million in 1937). Export of timber and wood-products increased from 358·4 million roubles in 1936 to 436·4 million roubles in 1937, while petroleum products exported fell slightly in value (160·8 million roubles in 1936, and 150·1 million roubles in 1937).

In imports we observe a reduction in machinery, heavy metal, chemical products, and electrical apparatus.

Great Britain is the largest purchaser for Soviet exports, while the U.S.A. provides the largest part of imports into Russia. Soviet exports to Spain in 1937 formed 5·3 per cent. of the total, whereas in previous years it has been 0·6 to 0·8 per cent. Russia's most favourable trade balance is with England, export to England being valued at 74·1 million roubles more than import from that country. The largest unfavourable balance is that in trade with the U.S.A. where import is 109·8 million roubles more than export. The Soviet press is now urging that in the

near future all importation of foreign goods be stopped, and that Soviet Russia depend entirely upon itself for supplies.

### *Agriculture.*

#### 1. Collective Farms.

During April there appeared several decrees of the Soviet of Peoples Commissaries touching the life and activity of collective farms. One, of 28 April, simplifies the hitherto very elaborate system of accounting and statistics, which has been found unworkable. Another decree stipulates that 50-70 per cent. of all the cash income of a given collective farm must be used in paying the farm-members for work done, instead of, as often hitherto, fixing an unreasonably low wage for labour in order to make possible larger expenditures for administrative and other purposes.

Decrees of 19 and 23 April aim at correcting abuses in the matter of indiscriminate exclusion of members from collective farms, which took place in connection with the mass "purges" of 1937. Many people have been cruelly deprived of all means of sustenance, often in processes which contravene the legal constitution of collective farms. The decree also forbids further purges of collective farms for any reason whatsoever; it orders that in future expulsion from a collective farm may be employed only as an extreme measure and only after all other legal methods of persuasion have been tried, and that exclusion shall be decided only at a general meeting at which at least two-thirds of all members are present. It is further required that in case of exclusion, "the most careful attention be given to the appeal against this decision by the person involved," and that all pending appeals against exclusion orders be heard and settled before 1 November.

The new office of "Agent of the Regional Executive Committee of the Commissariat of Agriculture" was established in April, for the collection of taxes "in kind." Each such agent must reside in his district, and in addition to his salary may receive premiums for good work.

#### 2. Spring Sowing.

The Grain Plan (spring and winter sowing) for 1938 indicated smaller production than the plan for 1937: 127 million hectares in 1938, 135.2 million hectares in 1937. This reduction is officially explained by an effort to increase the quality of agricultural production, although the steady increase in mechanisation shown by Soviet statistics would lead us to expect an increase. The increase in tractors, for example, is shown by the following table:—

1935	..	..	..	..	..	6.1 million H.P.
1936	..	..	..	..	..	7.3    "    "
1937 (plan)	..	..	..	..	..	9.4    "    "
1938 (plan)	..	..	..	..	..	10.9    "    "

Further explanation of the reduced area to be sown may be found in reports of delayed repair of agricultural machinery and inefficient preparation and delivery of seed-grain.

Sowing operations have proceeded more slowly than in 1937, although spring began earlier than last year. Thus on 30 April, 1937, 49·6 million hectares had been sown, as against 44·1 million this year. The Soviet press accuses the agencies in charge of sowing with poor management and lack of contact with the peasants. Other sources indicate that peasants in collective farms are giving increasing attention to the plots of land they are permitted to cultivate for themselves, to the detriment of collectivised land.

### 3. Live Stock.

On 1 January a census of live-stock in Russia was made. As indicated in the following table, there has been a general increase :—

	1 Jan., 1937.	1 Jan., 1938.	Per cent. of
	(Million heads).		increase.
Cattle .. ..	47·5	50·9	7·2
Sheep and goats ..	53·8	66·6	23·8
Swine .. ..	20·0	25·7	28·8
Horses .. ..	15·9	16·2	2·1

The notably small increase in horses (in some sections the number has actually diminished) is partly explained by the fact that the horse is the one animal individual peasants in collective farms may not buy, hence they are not interested in this section of stock-breeding.

### *Local Trials.*

Since the major trial of Bukharin, Rykov and others mentioned in our last Chronicle, there have appeared only sporadic records of local trials of less significance.

## REVIEWS

*Nationalgeist und Politik: Beiträge zur Erforschung der tieferen Ursachen des Weltkrieges.* By Friedrich Hertz. Vol. I. Zürich (Europa-Verlag), 1937. Pp. 479.

IN this book Dr. Hertz has set himself the difficult and delicate task of probing the deeper underlying causes of the great tragedy of 1914-18, not resting content, like so many writers, with the views of hidebound diplomatists of the old school, but attempting to analyse those decisive forces "which lie in the state tradition, in national consciousness and in the ideology of the leading Estates," and which go to form that evasive thing called "public opinion." In this task he has been remarkably successful: no more penetrating study of tendencies in all the leading countries of Europe has hitherto appeared. This first volume—which

is to be followed by a second, specially devoted to foreign policy during the 30 years' reign of William II—surveys in fourteen admirably balanced chapters the main tendencies of political thought in the chief European countries during last century. "The powers of violence and mendacity unchained by the war are successfully continuing the work of destruction begun by the cannon," and it is vital to get behind the rival propagandas and consider dispassionately the psychological factors which determine the divergences and disputes among the nations. The rich collections of diplomatic documents published since the war by all the Great Powers save Italy contain a mine of information on the outlook and actions of the official world in the particular country concerned, but little or nothing is to be gleaned from them as to such important movements as Pan-Germanism, *Los von Rom*, *Action Française*, and so on, for the simple reason that even the ablest of pre-war diplomatists tended to move in somewhat restricted circles and were afraid of unconventional contacts.

In two chapters—the first treating of the origin of the Austrian state idea, down to the upheaval of 1848, the second and much longer, of the complex interplay of national rivalries in the Habsburg Monarchy between 1848 and the Great War—he traces the long historical process by which Bohemia, Hungary and Poland successively failed to achieve that union of the Danubian lands which the Habsburgs were then destined to carry out and uphold for nearly four centuries. He sees the fatal blunder of the Habsburgs in their dissipation of effort in modern times (*raumliche Zerstreuung der Machtziele* is untranslatable, yet as apposite as it is involved): the double-headed eagle, facing both eastwards and westwards from the Danube to the Rhine, from Italy or Germany to Hungary or the Balkans, is the symbol of their fatal habit of overstretching and so leaving every policy half completed.

The chapter on the Prussian state ideal forms an admirable counterpart to the earlier Austrian chapter. In one direction he probably does not differ greatly from the reinterpreters of German history whom the Third Reich has thrown up—namely in regretting the fatal influence of the Imperial idea upon the medieval Germans, leading them to exhaust their strength on endless Italian wars and the Roman mirage, instead of checking feudalism at home and creating a sound financial and administrative system, with the result that the princely power grew like a rank weed and outdid even Italy in particularist and fissiparous tendencies. Dr. Hertz has some daring but thoroughly justified comments to make on Prussian historical writers, and, above all, on the legend that has gathered round Frederick the Great. As he points out, "if today Alsace belongs to France, if Germany in East Europe has forfeited a powerful position and still greater possibilities, if millions of Germans have been handed over to Slav rulers, if the German people alone had no colonial territory, all this is largely a consequence of his activities." He deliberately made over Alsace to the French in order to ensure his own possession of Silesia. He set himself to prevent Austrian expansion

eastwards, and he was, above all, responsible for the partition of Poland, but while he and the Habsburgs fought for the Silesian duchies, Britain was free to found her world empire. Dr Hertz is absolutely right to challenge the legend, widely believed in Germany, that Frederick and Kant were kindred spirits, linked together by the "categorical imperative," and again he has some plain words on Frederick's supposed "religious tolerance," which was really an attitude of complete and scoffing irreligion, exploiting the Church in the interests of the State and favouring the Jesuits only because they were banned by other monarchs and even by the Pope.

No less frank and critical is his chapter on Bismarckian statecraft. It is made clear that Austria in the middle of last century was widely regarded as "*ein dem Deutschtum entfremdeter Staat*," and not entirely without reason, despite the political predominance of the Germans. Thus Bismarck's "Little German" policy tended to conserve the purely German character of Prussia and the Reich. The war between Austria and Prussia was naturally unpopular among most Germans, but both it and the other two wars of 1864 and 1870 were coolly premeditated. The method actually adopted by Bismarck was *not* inevitable, and the idea that it was indispensable to overthrow Austria and France before unity could be achieved is a legend. On the other hand, the German Liberals were narrow and doctrinaire in their political outlook, and played into Bismarck's hands. Another point rarely stressed by other writers is that Bismarck was highly critical of "racial policy" as such, especially as pursued by the Austrian Germans (p. 142). A special chapter is devoted to Alsace-Lorraine, starting boldly from the thesis that two irreconcilable and equally exaggerated legends had been allowed to form themselves since 1870—that of a vindication of lost rights by Germany, and that of a brutal German conquest in disregard of the wishes of the population. The more than equivocal attitude of the Great Elector towards Louis XIV's seizure of Alsace, and again Frederick the Great's complaisance towards France in the same question (in 1752 Frederick wrote "Silesia and Lorraine are two sisters, the elder married to Prussia, the younger to France") are duly stressed. The later *revanche* outlook of certain French circles is placed in due perspective, but it is pointed out that William II's constant and quite genuine efforts to win over France were altogether pointless if he really thought the idea of *revanche* to be ineradicable.

If the chapter on the Eastern Question, though very sound, is rather dry and conventional, those upon English political thought and nationalism and imperialism are of altogether special interest and more calmly balanced than the brilliant and sympathetic, but almost embarrassingly complimentary, studies of Professor Kantorowicz. At the outset he reminds his readers that the British have theorised far less than most nations as to the ingredients that make up their national character. He again makes a point too often forgotten, that the Germans have been as

great colonisers as the British, but owing to political circumstances did not unite with the Reich many of the territories which they colonised in East Europe. In the British case, too, the religious factor (especially in the American colonies) gave a peculiar turn to the whole evolution "The development of modern nationalism is everywhere bound up with the drawing back of Christianity and the rise of a purely naturalistic conception . . . The nations took the place of God, nationalism became a sort of substitute for religion."

There follows a sketch of the political ideas of Seeley and Froude (Dilke hardly gets his due), and especially of Joseph Chamberlain; the influence of Hegel's teaching on the State upon Bosanquet, and the role of Darwinism are only touched on in passing. The remainder of the Chapter is devoted to exploding the superficial view that trade rivalry was the main cause of the Anglo-German quarrel, Britain having in 1913 a larger trade with Germany than with any Dominion save India, and Germany taking from her more than France and Russia combined. Two other vital facts are that the United States was a far more dangerous competitor and yet there was no trace of a quarrel between her and us, and again that it was just trade and banking circles (with certain known and notorious exceptions), which were most Germanophil on the eve of the War. But "the bare existence of the English World Empire had an irritating effect on Germany. For how can a nation of warriors endure that an unwarlike state organisation should largely encircle the planet, like Fafner on his treasure?"

Nothing better illustrates the universality and breadth of Dr. Hertz's political philosophy than the fact that his French and Russian chapters are in every way worthy of his German, Austrian and British chapters. It is impossible to dwell further on the details, but it is worth pointing out the clear distinction which he draws between "Russian" and "Panslav" nationalism, the great influence of Herder on all the Slav peoples, the special appeal of pacifism to the Slav peasant (this he traces back from Herder to Comenius), and his insistence that legends, even when demonstrably false, may exercise great influence.

In the concluding chapter Dr. Hertz traces the development of German nationalism through the Reformation, the Age of Enlightenment, the romantic and Liberal movements, and the decisive influence of "the tradition and structure of the Prussian military state," closing with a sketch of the Pan-German movement and some of its more notable publications, while making it clear that the German Government stood aloof from such extravagant designs and that Kiderlen-Waechter, in particular, after a discreet flirtation with the Pan-German League, decided that this was too risky, and drew back, and again that war actually came "over a cause that was not directly connected with Pan-German aims." But he rightly stresses the great part played by its long pre-war agitation in keeping a by no means negligible section of the nation in a state of nationalist ferment and exaltation.

Altogether a book which deserves close attention from all students and whose closing volume will be eagerly awaited. The Austrian tragedy has driven its author to our shores, and it is to be hoped that an English edition will be found practicable, and that his great learning and philosophic outlook will meet with the welcome and appreciation which they deserve.

R. W. SETON-WATSON.

*Bismarck a Polska (Bismarck and Poland)*. Jozef Feldman. Warsaw and Katowice. 1938. Pp. 450.

FOR two reasons it was to be expected that the person and work of the Iron Chancellor should come in for fresh attention in our time: (i) because, with the opening of various archives, a wealth of new and unmined materials has been brought to light, and (ii) because of what is now going on before our eyes in Central Europe, amounting—as many think, to an effort to complete what Bismarck began. Dr. Valentin's book on the Founding of the Reich (in German), has a fitting mate in this comprehensive study by Professor Feldman of Cracow, in the Polish Tongue. (There is a brief résumé of the argument given in English at the end of the book.)

"Europe has lost a Mistress, but gained a Master," was one of the cryptic comments made on Sedan. Certainly few men have left their mark more visibly on the world about them than the "Smith of the German Empire." And among those who, as a national group, felt the force and fury of that Master, the Poles occupy the first place. It was not Bismarck's fault that he found himself in such a pass. He was the heir of the ages. A perverse fate had decreed that a sea-going commercial people should push along the Baltic eastward, crossing the path of an inland, agricultural nation, which sought a window on the world around the mouth of the Vistula. The conflict grew with the coming of the Teutonic Knights; and the alliance of the Great Elector with the roving Swedish Protestants against Catholic Poland was but another stage of it. Things came to a head when the restless spirit of Frederick II got to work, under whose tutelage "Prussia starved her way to greatness." A century later came the man on whom the mantle of Frederick fell—Otto von Bismarck.

Dr. Feldman has not ventured on this work without years of preparation. Already a number of special studies have appeared, one each in French and English among them. He did not choose the way taken by Wendt in *Bismarck und die Polnische Frage*, but something much more ambitious. On the background of European affairs he has given us a picture of the life and work of a man to whom "the Polish question was not only a vital matter of Prussian politics, but an issue inseparable from the whole international situation." To this wider issue the essay now under review is a real contribution.

We are reminded at the outset of the inevitability of Polish-Prussian rivalry—*vita mea, mors tua*! But it all took on a new phase when, with the Partitions, Poland lost her independence and became the victim of

aggression of three neighbour empires. Bismarck grew to manhood while this state of things, confirmed by the Congress of Vienna—though in modified form, was being tried out. Two schools of thought in Prussia viewed it from opposite angles. The one counselled considerate treatment of the "Minority," with equality of status and privilege, and the hope of a loyal submission by way of return. The other rejected such measures, standing for repression, the methods of the *Polizeistaat*, and the firmest policy of denationalisation.

The future Prussian statesman woke up in 1848 to realise what Polish sentiment meant. Dr. Feldman shows us how mistaken people have been who thought that the spirit of 1848 in the German world was really well-disposed toward Poland. Even the urgings of Marx were silenced by the enunciations of his colleague Engels. During the fifties Bismarck came to see, what no one else realised as yet, that various antagonisms might exist between Prussia, Russia and Austria; but one thing united them closely, the necessity of keeping Poland under. The sequel was to show how the barometer of severity, or the opposite, would rise and fall in curious sympathy in the three empires. The first-fruits of this came out during the Crimean War. A decade later these were to appear as a canon of policy, when the new Prussian Minister succeeded in maintaining the closest of relations with St. Petersburg—though the liberal elements were clamouring for support of the Polish insurrectionists. This battle with all who stood for free institutions was not an easy one, but three successful wars did their work; and the Imperial Chancellor could safely undertake in 1873 what would have been out of the question a decade earlier. The field of action had by this time shifted to religion.

Historians do not agree as to how grave Bismarck's fear of Rome was, but in effect it seems to have mounted steadily from the rise of Ultra-Montanism in the forties. Certain it is that in the decision of the man he himself had accepted as Archbishop of Poznań, the Polish Count Ledochowski, to be first a Churchman, second a patriot, and only in the third place a Prussian subject, he saw a serious threat to all his dreams. The axis Rome, Vienna, Poznań could not be endured lightly. Hence the severity of the May Decrees of 1873, and the ensuing measures taken against the Polish language, in school, in the courts, and in public offices. Hence, too, the carrying on of the campaign against the Poles, in the economic field, after the religious issue had been settled with Leo XIII.

To follow the course of the struggle would take us too far here. Bismarck meant to serve his state and his people, but he made serious mistakes. Hating above all the Polish landed gentry and the clergy, he praised the peasant class as loyal Prussians, and never appreciated the changes effected in the generation following 1861 by men like Jackowski and Wawrzyniak, which made the Polish Minority into a state within the state, a power against which even Prussia could do little. In general, it seems as though, living by and for the *Staatsidee*, the Chancellor never understood the meaning of *Volkstum*, or as we



should say, nationhood. It is the curious irony of history that the treatment meted out by Prussia to her Poles in pre-war times was determined by everything else than the situation obtaining in the country itself.

Dr Feldman's longest chapter—just ninety pages, is devoted to the whole tissue of diplomatic and other events surrounding the Insurrection of 1863–64. There is no doubt that Bismarck was disturbed by the liberal tendencies in Russia after Sebastopol, and the way Gorchakov met the advances of Count Wielopolski in paving the path to better times in Congress Poland. He won the attention of Alexander II for his views, and showed—as newer source materials have revealed, an almost headlong zeal in mobilising Prussian army corps to help Russia in 1863. This move and the Alvensleben Convention, almost immediately disowned by the man who had engineered it, hurt the very causes they were meant to serve, and for a time Bismarck found himself in unpleasant circumstances, entirely of his own making. Whether this zeal was dictated more by fear, or more by Prussian ambitions to see the “Knesebeck Frontier” realised must be left on one side. At one time eager to champion Russia, this master of intrigue was ready at another to rob the Tsar of all Polish territory!

As was inevitable, the Chancellor overreached himself. From the moment when he got the Polish Question dismissed from the councils of Europe, he could see the most effective bond being loosened which held the Dynasties together. Even in the seventies Russia began to draw toward France, the eighties saw Bismarck contemplating the reunion of Polish lands as a buffer to the east, and the nineties saw an open breach. Thus the great work was undone, and not even a movement from below—the League for Defence of the Eastern Marches, to which he gave his support in his last years, could save it. The year 1891 saw the Polish nation more united and roused than it had been for a century. The hopes of assimilation were more distant than ever.

What a pity that Dr. Feldman's careful account of all this drama is not available for a wider circle of readers at the present time! After all the point of view of a competent Polish scholar is of vital importance.

W. J. ROSE.

*The Annexation of Bosnia* (1908–9). By Bernadotte E. Schmitt. Cambridge (University Press), 1937. 264 pages. 12s. 6d. net.

THIS volume scarcely requires detailed commendation to our readers, since the first seven chapters originally appeared in this *Review* (Nos 26–30). It, of course, sets out to perform a limited function, not attempting to investigate the nationalist psychologies which lay behind the long crisis and in large measure determined its course. But it is a model of what a monograph in diplomatic history should be, and in impartiality and minute accuracy it is in every way worthy of its author. The narrative which he has constructed is much the clearest and most authoritative hitherto available, but, unfortunately, the one document

still missing, and one of capital importance, namely, Izvolsky's report of his eventful discussions with Aehrenthal at Buchlau—evaded Professor Schmitt's grasp, though he took the trouble to visit the archives in Moscow and held it in his hands. He is too tactful to indicate what was the reason of a copy being withheld from him, but those with some knowledge of the almost inconceivable red tape of Bolshevik bureaucracy, even in the sphere of academic research, will draw their own conclusions.

It thus unhappily still remains open, whether there was a misunderstanding between the two statesmen as to the date of annexation (as might be inferred from Aehrenthal's own report), or whether Aehrenthal was bent on deliberately deceiving his Russian colleague. In view of the perfidy of Aehrenthal's methods (notably his lie to Sir E. Goschen, on which King Edward commented so drastically to Grey) the latter explanation is not improbable. But still more probable is it that the intent to deceive was equal on both sides, but that Izvolsky this time met his master in strategy. And then, as Mr Schmitt neatly puts it, "the wrangling of six Foreign Ministers for a period of six months, represented almost the nadir of diplomacy . . . Between them Aehrenthal and Izvolsky destroyed the Austro-Russian entente, which for some years had preserved a kind of balance in the Balkans, brought their countries face to face in what proved to be a mortal duel, and envenomed their future policies by a bitter personal antagonism."

R. W. SETON-WATSON.

*Czechs and Germans*, a Study of the Struggle in the Historic Provinces of Bohemia and Moravia. By Elizabeth Wiskemann. (Oxford University Press, 1938: issued under the auspices of the Royal Institute of International Affairs.) Price 12s. 6d.

THE author first gives an historical survey of the relations between Czechs and Germans in the past, then describes conditions in present Czechoslovakia and discusses all important administrative, economic, social and cultural problems connected with the national conflict. Her book is the fruit of extensive studies both in history and in the field of actual facts, which usually can only be rightly understood in their historical evolution. She has formed her views, not only from books but has visited many parts of Czechoslovakia, talking with both Czechs and Germans in their own language and with the desire to understand their attitude. In this she has admirably succeeded, and her book must be regarded as the present standard work on the subject. It would be petty to point out small gaps or disputable views. On the whole the author deserves our greatest gratitude. Her book is particularly welcome, as we hear today so many voices of well-meaning ignorants who believe that the problem could simply be solved by carving up Czechoslovakia in the name of national self-determination. It is easy to show that this would be no solution at all, and that the result would be a state of oppression worse than anything of which German nationalists may at

present complain. The author, however, does not deny that the Germans have reasons for complaint. She quite sees that many mistakes have been committed which were bound to arouse German national feelings, though it may have been difficult or impossible to avoid such mistakes. The roots of the antagonism are unfortunately too deeply and firmly embedded in the historical experiences of both nations to admit of simple rational solutions. The government ought certainly to have done more in former years to meet German grievances and to conciliate the saner part of the German population. Yet would the Czech nationalists have admitted such measures, and would the German nationalists have been satisfied by them, or would they rather have been encouraged to increase their demands with every concession? On the whole, the author thinks the democratic Republic of Czechoslovakia has given its minorities more equitable treatment and greater opportunities to express their views and win consideration for them than most other States confronted with similar problems. In conclusion, she discusses the different solutions proposed. Many plans have been put forward, yet none seems to be both satisfactory and realisable. This is mainly due to the existence of large territories of mixed nationality. The author says: "The more one examines the Czech-German problem, the more evident it becomes that there is no very clear distinction to be made between the cession of the mainly German territories of Czechoslovakia to Germany and the complete domination of Central Europe—Czech-speaking territories included—by the Germans." Therefore Masaryk's word seems to her justified, that the alternative is only whether some 3 million Germans shall be without their own State or whether 10 million Czechs and Slovaks shall be swallowed up in an alien political community. The ultimate conclusion of the author is rather pessimistic. She says: "In the circumstances of Europe today the problem of the Historic Provinces cannot be satisfactorily solved. A wise government can greatly reduce friction; but whatever the government, friction there will be, so long as racialistic nationalism is regarded as an absolute standard of good." A. M.

*Britain and the Dictators.* By R. W. Seton-Watson. Cambridge Press. 1938. Pp. 469. 12s. 6d.

THIS book might be called a Postscript to *Britain in Europe*. But a document of these dimensions is much more than that. What we have here is a serious study, which stands on its own feet and by its own weight. Further, though "written for every man who opens a newspaper," it can bear without fear the scrutiny of the specialist in international affairs. Here and there the reader may wish to quarrel with something, but the argument is open and above-board. What is more the book is most timely, not an easy thing to achieve in the hurry of our days.

The purpose of these notes is rather to commend a most useful and courageous book to readers of *The Slavonic Review*, than to appraise or criticise. As all know, Professor Seton-Watson has won his unique

position as an authority on Eastern Europe by at least a generation of consistent study. There are those who say—mostly with sorrow, or even in anger—that he is responsible for more frontiers in Europe than all the diplomats. Be that as it may, he has given us in twelve chapters, and an Epilogue—on the Austrian occupation, an account of things as to many of which he might truly say *et quorum pars magna fui*!

He is not uncritical of the Versailles Treaty, but he says quite truly that more of the claims for revision have rested on political calculations than on national or moral grounds. He surveys Britain's relations with Moscow, Rome and Berlin, for good reasons giving much the longest chapter to the third. Then follows a sketch of the new States and their Minority problems, and an account of the Mediterranean "gamble" in both its aspects: the eastern in Abyssinia and the western in Spain.

We see clearly the extent to which this "gamble" is a direct challenge to British and French interests on their most material plane. But we are shown how the whole march of totalitarianism is a threat to two things Britons, and many others, have come to love and cherish: (i) the theory and practice of free institutions, the advantages of which far outweigh their weakness, and (ii) the hope of arriving in international relations at some kind of law and order, analogous to the kind of thing on which most civilised communities stand.

It is perhaps too much to expect that the reign of reason will commend itself to the wider reaches of mankind, who not only do not "think deeply" (Eden's phrase), but are for the most part innocent of thinking at all. But Seton-Watson clearly belongs to those who do not despair of the prospects of reason (rather than emotionalism) commending itself to those who govern the nations; so that those living may see the day when the will to work together will prevail over the will to quarrel, and a sense of responsibility of the stronger toward the weaker may take the place of the blind urge to subdue and to exploit.

W. J. R.

*Histoire de Dalmatie.* Vol. I. *Des Origines au Marché Infâme* (1409); Vol. II. *Des Griffes du Lion Ailé à la Libération* (1409-1918). By Comte L. de Voinovich (Lujó Vojnović). Paris (Hachette), 1934. 894 pp.

EDWARD FREEMAN—the pioneer in this country of understanding for the unfamiliar and much misunderstood Southern Slav Question—wrote in his essay on the Illyrian Emperors, that "the physical position of Dalmatia has ever made it the marchland of languages, empires and religions," between East and West, lying as it does "on the border of those two great divisions of Europe which we may severally speak of as the Greek and Latin worlds." It is this fact—reflected in its geography and in the mentality of its inhabitants—that gives to Dalmatia a peculiar fascination of its own. She has now found in Count Vojnović a historian worthy of such a subject, and these two

volumes, constituting the fullest narrative in any language, have obviously been a labour of love, and crown a long life of research into the history of the Ragusan Republic and other kindred studies (combined, it is true, with active political work in most Balkan countries). The brother of that gifted dramatist, Ivo Vojnović, has a literary and artistic sense that is all his own. It may be that he has lingered a little too lovingly over the earliest period of Dalmatian history, but some readers will be specially grateful for his imaginative treatment of *The Voyage of Cadmus* and *The Dragon and the Wolf*. It may be well that he goes too far in asserting that "in all the naval battles of Antiquity and of modern times" (doubtless as regards the Adriatic and Greek Coast) "the attitude of Dalmatian seamen determined the victory" (p. 121). When he insists that "Roman Peace" never achieved the complete assimilation or Romanising of the Dalmatian coastline, he is on firmer, though still contested, ground. But in describing the rôle of the great Illyrian peasant Emperors in reorganising the Empire in the 3rd century, and thus arresting its final decay, it is hardly possible to be too emphatic. Decius, Claudius, Aurelian, Probus, Carus, pass before us; then the great figure of Diocletian is sketched with discerning tenderness, as a statesman rather than a soldier, a man with far-reaching administrative and strategic views, no mere persecutor as he is sometimes portrayed, but finding in his wonderful seaside palace and its gardens a consolation for the barren vanities of power.

Constantine also was born in *Illyria* in a wider sense; but he does not figure on the narrower stage of Dalmatia. One other prominent figure, however, Dalmatia did produce amid the rapid decline of the Empire—while indeed she was once more revealing her character as borderland between East and West. Of St. Jerome, Count Vojnović writes. "Nature violente, excessive en tout, autoritaire, tranchant, polémiste fougueux et sans rival, féministe, croyant fermement que sur le facteur femme se fonde la vie morale et sociale de l'humanité, homme de la foi la plus profonde, ascète jusqu'à l'inanition, érudit prodigieux, un des plus grands de tous les siècles, Jérôme était par tous ses défauts et par toutes ses qualités un authentique enfant de la Dalmatie, un Illyrien romanisé!" And then his fantasy takes flight, and Jerome is intriguingly compared to "a Christian Clemenceau, who could not be Pope despite the popular favour which surrounded him in Rome, for the same reasons which prevented the Gallo-Roman of La Vendée—ardent, impetuous and personal, like the Roman-Illyrian Jerome—from becoming the Chief of the French State—because the mediocrities and intriguers of Rome were to make his candidature fail." (p. 174).

In the 5th century Dalmatia finds herself balanced between the Roman and barbarian worlds; after a series of obscure interludes under Marcellinus, Nepotian and Julius Nepos, the province is ceded by the Byzantine Emperor to Theodoric, who sends it a Viceroy under the curious title of "Princeps Dalmatiarum." With the decline of the Gothic

Kingdom, Byzantium reasserts its sway, but ere long this is overthrown by the Slavs (*race poétique*, interjects our imaginative author) and less permanently by the Avars, who sack the great Roman city of Salona in 614, but in the end are ejected, conquered or assimilated.

In the 9th century it is in Dalmatia that the Croat State first establishes itself, its capital, Nin or Nona, must have been of considerable size and importance, if the legend be true, according to which it contained seventy-two churches, with as many canons, in memory of the seventy-two disciples of Jesus. Little trace of all this is left, and little that is reliable is known of Bishop Gregory, whose giant symbolic statue by Meštrović now decorates the peristyle of Split Cathedral. He stands for the Slav idea, and for the ancient Glagolitic liturgy which still lingers on the coast, and which has since defied all assaults on the "barbara seu sclavinica lingua." There was another more ephemeral state with its capital at Sisak, of which M. Vojnović says with some exaggeration "Jugoslavia today is nothing else than the Empire of Ljudevit the Pannonian, realised after a political servitude of ten centuries" (p. 275).

Meanwhile the coast towns maintained their link with Byzantium, while the young Kingdom in the main held both Byzantines and Franks at bay, only to succumb to the encroaching Slavs. These towns the author not unfittingly ranks with Venice and other Italian towns of the Adriatic as "un essor du génie municipal romain, tel qu'il a évolué au contact du christianisme et des idées empruntées après la chute de l'Empire au réservoir commun slave-latin" (p. 361). Their statutes are among the oldest in Europe and survived a whole series of *régimes*.

The book has been subjected to a good deal of criticism by Yugoslav historians, owing to its rather inadequate account of the period of the Croat Kings (circa 927-1104); here there is certainly an error of proportion, if we consider the much fuller measure meted out to the dreary annals of the 12th, 13th and 14th centuries, when Croatian independence has fallen before the Magyar invaders, and Dalmatia in particular becomes a bone of contention between Hungary, Venice and Byzantium—the latter soon dropping out of the struggle and leaving the other two to fight on till the final capitulation of 1420. Up to a certain point M. Vojnović can doubtless justify his method by pointing to the lack of material, and to the deliberate suppression by Venice of much ancient documentary evidence, and cannot be taken too seriously to task for refusing to clothe the somewhat shadowy figures of Tomislav or Zvonimir with myth and conjecture, as compensation for solid fact. None the less he shows a curious indifference to a period to which many patriots have attached an altogether exaggerated importance; we cannot but regret that he did not establish a *juste milieu*, by summarising such fragmentary records as do exist, and especially by devoting closer attention to the relations of Gregory VII with Croatia and to the all too obscure circumstances of Koloman's conquest of Croatia for Hungary.

What he has to say of the long rivalry for the mastery of the Adriatic

is very just. Venice aimed at erecting a corridor to cover her commerce eastwards, she cared nothing for Dalmatian interests and for the fate of the mountainous and savage hinterland, though she was eager to prevent the formation of any continental Power based upon Dalmatia (this was why in the end she twice had to push her frontier further inland against the Turks). The adventure of the Fourth Crusade (beginning with the conquest of Zara) and the Latin Empire are rightly described as deciding for centuries the mastery of the Mediterranean, for Dandolo in effect, by undermining Byzantium's powers of resistance, handed it over to Asiatic barbarism, his true successor being Mohammed II (p. 399).

In the 14th century Dalmatia is in the thrall of powerful and undisciplined feudal barons such as the Counts of Bribir, while the communes balance between Venice and Hungary, and Ragusa profits by her relative remoteness to build up a special position of her own. The three great figures of that age are Louis the Great, the Angevin King of Hungary, who in 1358 acquires the greater part of Dalmatia, the distant Slav Emperor Charles IV in Prague and the upstart Nemanjic Emperor Stephen Dušan, who as he pressed westwards to Cattaro and Durazzo, found Venice a most useful ally. Of the three, Louis inevitably fills a larger portion of the stage—not a man of real genius, indeed something of a dilettante, lacking perseverance and *esprit de suite*, and yet full of vast conceptions, *rude joueur mais mauvais joueur*, hesitating between a crusade against the Turks and an onslaught upon the loosely-knit Serb and Bulgar states, but constantly decoyed into ambitious Italian projects which led nowhere and merely drained the resources of what was still the most powerful kingdom of Central Europe.

The 16th and 17th centuries, with which the 2nd volume opens, are described, surely with undue emphasis, as the saddest in all Dalmatian history. The League of Cambrai, in which Pope and Emperor combined in vain for the overthrow and partition of Venice, is treated in considerable detail, the excuse being that Dalmatia was the bribe offered for the support of Vladislav of Hungary and Bohemia, and that Dalmatia and the Ionian Isles were already the key to Venice's whole position—alike strategically, as securing communications with her Levantine possessions and in a still more material sense, owing to her dependence upon them for the food supplies of the capital. Meanwhile, ever since the fall of Bosnia in 1463, a new danger, the Turkish, had been steadily growing, and served as a check to Venetian expansion along the coast. At its height Turkish rule reached to the very gates of the Dalmatian cities, some of which replenished their population with noble Bosnian refugees. The mountain fortress of Klis (Clissa), perched in full view of Split itself and of the "seven castles" between that town and Trogir (Traù), was in Turkish hands for about a century, and a perpetual menace. Šibenik, too, for a long time saw more than half its territory in Turkish hands and was a mere rock amid the floods.

M. Vojnović draws an interesting contrast between Venice's

astonishing neglect of her land forces in the 16th century and the care which she devoted to her navy, manned in large measure by "Schiavoni" and Greeks. Incidentally he considers the charge levelled against Venice, of responsibility for deforestating the Dalmatian coast, to be considerably exaggerated, and credits the fierce *bora* wind and the goats with at least their share. On the other hand he goes too far when he includes as an important factor in the decline of Venice, "l'élimination progressive des éléments constitutifs slaves dans le sang vénitien" (p. 567).

Considerable space is devoted to the steady inroads of the Turks in Dalmatia, their treaty of 1540 with Venice, the rôle of the Uzkok pirates, owing allegiance to Ferdinand of Habsburg as Hungarian and Croatian king, and the decisive events of Lepanto in 1571. "Rebels of St. Mark, Spaniards, Germans, traitors, brigands"—such were the terms of abuse levelled against the Uzkoks, who maintained an obstinate double front against Venice on sea and Turkey on land, and loyally served the Habsburg cause, like their kinsmen, the Graničari on the Austro-Turkish river front. It is difficult to avoid the conclusion that with the 17th century the author is beginning to lose interest in his theme. He summarises the steps by which Venice extended her borders in Dalmatia during the second half of the 17th century up to the final "Linea Mocenigo" or *Nuovissimo Acquistato* of 1721-33; but his treatment then becomes increasingly episodic, there is no clear account of the system of government under which Dalmatia lived, and the fall of the Republic is described solely in terms of Venice and of Bonaparte.

Chapter XIII, on "Le Libérateur Gaulois," opens with extracts from a vindication of Venice by that great "Italo-Slav" Dalmatian, Nicolò Tommaseo, and tells in outline the story of Napoleon's shortlived Illyrian experiment, the downfall of the Ragusan Republic, the British occupation of the islands after Hoste's naval victory over the French in 1811, the return of the Austrian troops under Croat commanders, and the re-establishment of Habsburg rule over Dalmatia. Chapter XIV "Le Retour au Foyer"—not a very accurate title, for Dalmatia had never been united with Serbia before 1918—throws useful light on the intricate quarrels of "autonomist" and "unionist" in the middle of last century, and their relations to Vienna; but as a guide to the history of Austrian rule from 1814 to 1918 it is exceedingly slight. The narrative virtually stops with the fall of Bajamonte, the famous Mayor of Split in the early eighties, and there is no attempt to explain the important rôle of the Dalmatians in the national movement in Croatia, above all as regards the Resolution of Fiume and the formation of the Croato-Serb Coalition. The names of Supilo and Trumbić, Perić, Bulat, Čingrija, and Biankini, are not even mentioned.

There remain two chapters which form a most attractive conclusion—an almost lyrical sketch of Ragusan history, and a series of vignettes under the title of "Hommes et Monuments," where the author is at his very best in imparting a human touch to his account of



Dalmatian art treasures. The splendid Cathedrals and other architectural gems of his native province are presented as "un écho fidèle de l'esprit dalmate—isolement, tradition, conservation, culte jaloux d'une beauté et d'un rite tout en dedans"

There is a useful bibliography of 516 items; but it is strange that Robert Adam's unique monograph on the Palace of Diocletian—which has a pre-eminent place in the history of Dalmatia and its art—should by an oversight have been omitted.

R. W. SETON-WATSON.

*Polski Słownik Biograficzny* (Polish D.N.B.). Published by the Polish Academy of Sciences (Gebetner i Wolf, Cracow and Warsaw). Vol. I, 1935 A—Bey, Vol. II, 1936 Bey—Brow, Vol. III, 1937 Brow—Chwal. Each volume 480 pp. 4to.

The three volumes, now available, of the Dictionary of National Biography enable us to form an opinion not only of the dimensions of this great enterprise, but also of the quality of work contained in it. The indications are that the whole work, when completed, will amount to some thirty volumes; filling a good deal of shelf-space even when the use of thin paper makes each book rather slenderer than the India Paper volumes of the *Encyclopædia Britannica*. Both printers and publishers have done their work admirably, and the price is extremely reasonable—about one pound sterling, in durable binding

No "review" of over 1,400 pages of greatly compressed biographical materials is possible here. One can only commend to all interested persons a work whose pages make a contribution of a unique nature to the cultural history of Europe. Beside a distinguished Board of Editors, with Professor Konopczyński of Cracow at their Head, we have a Council of Advisors, representing all fields of knowledge and activity. In this way not only elegance of form but also accuracy of matter are assured. A striking paragraph in the general Preface tells us that, badly as such a work was needed before, the conditions making its execution possible have only now been fulfilled. Certain it is, that the three volumes before us are an earnest of something very satisfying to come.

If one merely turns over the pages one will be struck by one fact. The names are not only Polish, but represent literally every national stock in Europe. This need not surprise those who know to what an extent Poland has been intimately related to every phase of European civilisation for close on a thousand years. We have Scots and Armenians, Latins and Muscovites, Catholics, Protestants, Orthodox, Jews and even Mahometans. The pedant might object to the inclusion of such figures as Bogdan Chmielnicki, or of the painters Bacciarelli and Canaletto (though the former was admitted to the ranks of the nobility while working in Warsaw). One might object also to the famous Bona Sforza, queen-consort of Sigismund I, who spent all her life in Poland but was born and died in her beloved south. It is to be regretted that the work was

too far on to include the names of the recently deceased historians Askenazy and Bobrzyński, and others of note. But these will no doubt find their place in a Supplement.

One significant fact is brought out in these pages, and it will come into relief even more later on. I mean the contribution made to the national heritage of Poland by the sons and daughters of single families. Taking at random two names—Branicki and Chodkiewicz, we find of the former family eighteen members, ranging over five full centuries, and of the latter, curiously enough, the same number—from the birth of one Alexander in 1457 to the death of another in 1838. Both the amount of service rendered by these men and its variety are remarkable. Few things show more conclusively the extent to which the stability of Polish civilisation, as well as many of its weaknesses, were bound up with the life of the land-owning families.

Every library in the world which claims to be in a position to furnish its readers with proper guidance in the study of western culture, must possess this work. A mass of materials is made available here, which can be found nowhere else. The language difficulty must be faced, but the serious student will not be intimidated by it. W. J. R.

## THE JOURNAL OF MODERN HISTORY

Edited by BERNADOTTE E. SCHMITT and LOUIS GOTTSCHALK

*A Quarterly Review devoted to the History of Europe and its  
Expansion from the Renaissance to the close of the Great War.*

### *Contents of the June Issue*

- THE ORIGIN OF CAPITAL STAFFS, by Dallas D. Irvine  
THE LUDDITE MOVEMENT IN FRANCE, by Frank E. Manuel  
ENGLAND AND THE FRENCH SEIZURE OF THE SOCIETY  
ISLANDS, by J. R. Baldwin  
DOCUMENTS PROBLEMS OF NEUTRALITY, 1854 DOCUMENTS  
FROM THE HAMBURG STAATSARCHIV, by Gavin B.  
Henderson  
REVIEW ARTICLE THE ABDICATION OF EDWARD VIII, by  
M. M. Knappen.

Reviews

Bibliography

Subscription, 19s. 6d. (post free) a year

PUBLISHED BY

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS

AGENTS IN GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS

200 EUSTON ROAD

LONDON N.W. 1.

# FOREIGN AFFAIRS

*An American Quarterly Review*

Hamilton Fish Armstrong—Editor



THE world's leading statesmen, economists and financial authorities write for FOREIGN AFFAIRS. They keep the readers of this important American review informed about the basic causes of the great events which today are making history.

## CONTENTS OF THE JULY ISSUE.

MILL'S LIBERTY TODAY .....	<i>Robert C. Binkley</i>
RAW MATERIALS AND FOREIGN POLICY.....	<i>Herbert Feis</i>
FINIS AUSTRIÆ.. .....	<i>M. W. Fodor</i>
THE FINANCIAL SITUATION OF FRANCE... ..	<i>Charles Rist</i>
CHINA'S FIGHTING GENERALISSIMO ....	<i>Edgar Snow</i>
THE NEW-OLD CRISIS IN MEXICO .....	<i>D. Graham Hutton</i>
THE BRITISH WAR DEBT: RETROSPECT AND PROSPECT.....	<i>George P. Auld</i>
THE GERMAN MINORITY IN CZECHOSLOVAKIA SECTIONAL FACTORS IN CANADIAN FOREIGN POLICY... ..	<i>R. W. Seton-Watson</i>
SWITZERLAND IN A CHANGING EUROPE .....	<i>J. A. Stevenson</i>
ANTHONY EDEN . .....	<i>William E. Rappard</i>
BOLIVIA'S CLAUSTROPHOBIA .....	<i>Victor Gordon Lennox</i>
FEUDAL AGRARIANISM IN HUNGARY .....	<i>Ronald Stuart Kain</i>
THE AUSTRIAN CONTRIBUTION TO GERMAN AUTARCHY .....	<i>Oscar Jászi</i>
THE PAN AMERICAN HIGHWAY .....	<i>Walter Hildebrand</i>
RECENT BOOKS ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS	<i>Warren Kelchner</i>
SOURCE MATERIAL .....	<i>Robert Gale Woolbert</i>
	<i>Denys P. Myers</i>

—also the usual maps and notes, bibliography of new books in the international field, index of treaties and trade agreements, etc.

Subscriptions: \$5 a year post free to any address.

Use form below for special offer.

TEAR OFF HERE

FOREIGN AFFAIRS, 45 East 65th St., New York.

Please enter me for a year's subscription and include, without charge, the issue described above. I enclose \$5 in payment.

Name .....

Street .....

City .....

July.





EDWARD BENEŠ

# THE SLAVONIC AND EAST EUROPEAN REVIEW

VOL. XVII. No. 50

January, 1939

---

## THE REVIEW OF THE ARMY

*Note*—*The Review of the Army* is one of the concluding episodes in the "Digression" at the close of *Forefathers' Eve, Part III*, published in 1832 (Translations of the earlier episodes of the "Digression" appeared in the *Slavonic Review* for April, 1935, and January, 1937). In them Mickiewicz gives impressions derived from his stay of about three months in St Petersburg in 1824-25, as an exile from his native Lithuania, along with other former students of the University of Wilno. He pours out his indignation at Russia as the oppressor of Poland.

*The Review of the Army* was translated from the Polish by G. R. Noyes and versified by Marjorie Beatrice Peacock.

Notes signed "M" are by Mickiewicz. Most of the other notes are based on those by Kallenbach in his edition of *Forefathers' Eve, Part III*, in the *Biblioteka narodowa*, but I have also consulted the edition by Schipper in the *Wielka biblioteka*, and have added some trifles from other sources.

G. R. NOYES

The baiting place some call this mighty square,  
For here the Tsar trains dogs to bait the bear;  
The dressing room say others tactfully,  
For here the Tsar fits on his royal suits,  
Ere, flanked by cannon, pikes, and musketry,  
He sallies forth for lesser kings' salutes.  
A vain coquette, preparing for a dance,  
Gives less time to her mirrored form and face,  
Rehearses no such air, such cloying glance,  
As does the great Tsar in that public place.  
Others see here the spot where locusts breed,  
They say that here the Tsar matures the seed  
Of clouds of grasshoppers, which on their birth  
Will from this square fly forth and seize the earth.  
A surgeon's whetstone it is sometimes named,  
For here the Tsar removes his lancet's rust  
Ere forth from Petersburg his arm is thrust  
And by his slashing is all Europe maimed.

But ere he tries how deep the wound may go,  
Ere he finds means to staunch the bloody flow,  
He cuts the pulse of Sultan and of Shah,  
And drains the life blood of Sarmatia.  
This oft-named place, renowned and vast and bare,  
Officials know as the reviewing square.

The hour of the review is ten o'clock,  
And to this square the silent townsfolk flock.  
It seems a white lake with a dusky shore;  
Each jostles past his neighbour to the fore  
Like seamews o'er the waves there flit about  
A few Don Cossacks and dragoons on guard;  
Their pike-butts deal each curious head a clout,  
On each protruding neck their whips fall hard.  
Men who, like frogs from swamps, have crawled ahead,  
Draw back their brows and necks in swift retreat.  
A rumble sounds afar off, muffled, dead,  
Like thud of flail or like a hammer's beat :  
That is the drum, the regimental guide.  
In perfect step the ranks march side by side,  
All clad as one : the fat, the short, the tall  
Afar, the green shows black against the snow;  
Like rivers, dark and smooth, the columns flow,  
And like a lake the square absorbs them all.

A hundred Homers' mouths, O Muse, I ask,  
In each a hundred French tongues for my task,  
Also the pens of all the bookkeepers,  
That I may mention all these officers,  
These subalterns and colonels, brave and fine,  
And honour all the heroes of the line !

But they look all alike, this dauntless band !  
Monotonously, side by side they stand,  
Like horses lined up at a trough to eat,  
Like all the ears bound in a sheaf of wheat,  
Like fields of hemp stalks covering the land,  
Like lines in books, like furrows straight and long,  
Like talk in a St. Petersburg salon.  
Yet here among the Muscovites appears  
A group six inches taller than the mass;  
Like stars on horses' brows, letters of brass

Shine on their caps—those are the grenadiers.  
Of such tall regiments I noticed three:  
Behind stood shorter heroes, row on row,  
Like cucumbers that in a garden grow.  
To mark the troops among this infantry  
One needs a naturalist's ability  
To glance at squirming swamp-worms as they pass,  
Distinguish them and place each in its class.

The trumpets blare! Forthwith the cavalry  
Rides in, a varied lot: uhlan, hussar,  
Dragoon. Helmets and caps and hats we see,  
As though it were a hatters' gay bazaar,  
With all the wares spread out to catch the eye.  
An armoured regiment comes riding by,  
Like samovars set trimly in a row:  
Heads, like spouts, stretch out below their sides  
The horses' heads, like spouts, stretch out below.  
Their riders variously armed and dressed,  
Are best distinguished by the steeds they ride,  
For all the newer tactics so decide,  
And thus with Russian custom coincide.  
The theory great Jomini<sup>1</sup> expressed,  
That mounts, not men, produce good cavalry,  
Has long prevailed in Russian policy.  
A good horse of the guards will always buy  
Three Russian soldiers fit for doughty deeds,  
While horses meant for officers come high,  
Costing four times as much, since for such steeds  
One gives a dancer, lute-player, or clerk,  
Or in expensive times a cook, perchance.  
Nags broken down, unfit for finer work,  
Including such as drag an ambulance,  
If set at stake when faro-addicts play,  
Are held as worth two women any day.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Baron Henri Jomini (1779-1869), general and writer on military subjects. Swiss by birth, he served first under Napoleon, but in 1813 transferred his allegiance to Russia.

<sup>2</sup> The horses of the Russian cavalry are handsome and command a high price. Horses for the soldiers of the guard often cost several thousand francs, while a grown man of the proper height may be bought for one thousand. During the famine in White Russia women were sold in St. Petersburg for two hundred francs apiece. I must confess with shame that some Polish landowners of White Russia supplied goods of this sort.—M.



But note the troops A black troop led the way;  
 The second, too, was black, but bobbed of tail;  
 Two were of bay, one yellow, sleek and pale,  
 Two sorrel, then the eighth, a mouse-like grey;  
 The ninth was tall, the tenth of middle height;  
 And then a second bob-tailed black rode past,  
 The twelfth had foreheads marked with spots of white,  
 While with a raven's plumage gleamed the last.  
 Of cannon, forty-eight drove on the scene,  
 Then twice as many caissons rumbled by :  
 In all, perhaps two hundred, as I ween  
 To estimate exactly with the eye  
 Amid such multitudes as they advance,  
 One needs, Napoleon, your keen, shrewd glance,  
 Or yours, commissioner of shell and shot  
 You, heedless of the troops that crowd the spot,  
 Survey the caissons and appraise the whole  
 From each you know what cartridges you stole !

Now the green uniforms have clothed the square  
 Like grass that decks a meadow in the spring.  
 Only a caisson rises here and there,  
 As 'twere a mighty swamp-frog slumbering,  
 Or yet a field-flea with a greenish back :  
 Near-by a cannon, darkly threatening,  
 Squats like a spider, fiercely strong and black.

Each spider has four legs set in the rear  
 And four in front : each leg, in foreign mode,  
 Is called a bombardier or cannoneer  
 While this vast insect sits upon the road  
 In sleepy ease, each leg moves off apart :  
 You think the belly from the crowded square  
 Will rise like a balloon into the air ;  
 But when this cannon rouses with a start  
 From out its dreams, summoned by a command,  
 As a tarantula<sup>3</sup> whose nose is fanned  
 By someone's breath draws in its legs in fear,  
 Ere it inflates its body to spit out  
 Its poison, with each forward cannoneer

<sup>3</sup> Tarantulas are a species of large, poisonous spiders that build nests over their burrows They are found on the southern steppes of Russia and Poland —M.

The gun makes rapid motions near its snout ;  
 Or as a fly, which, soiled on face and feet  
 With arsenic, sits washing itself neat,  
 Then backward throws its two front legs and twirls  
 Its rear ones, while its hindparts fall and rise,  
 At last throws sideways all its legs and lies  
 Briefly at rest—then forth its poison hurls

The soldiers stand and gaze The Tsar is here !  
 With him are seen a few old admirals,  
 A throng of adjutants and generals ;  
 He rides in front, his train keeps to the rear  
 The group is strangely splotched with every hue,  
 Like harlequins : upon their coats one sees  
 Small portraits, buckles, monograms, and keys ;  
 One has a scarf of yellow, one of blue :  
 More circles, stars, and crosses they display  
 Than there are buttons on each brave array.<sup>4</sup>

Thus they all shine, yet not with their own light ;  
 They gleam but in the Little Father's<sup>5</sup> sight ;  
 Each general is but a tiny worm  
 That on St. John's Eve glitters brilliantly :  
 For when the Tsar's regard has reached its term  
 These wretched insects fade amazingly.  
 They do not die or flee to foreign shores,  
 But no one knows what swamplands they defile.  
 A general goes boldly to the wars :  
 What if a bullet strikes ?—the Tsar will smile.  
 But when the Tsar shoots with ungracious eyes,  
 The doughty general fades, sickens—dies !

More oft amid the courtiers you will see  
 Stout-hearted stoics. When their hour is past  
 They do not cut their throats<sup>6</sup> or pine and fast,

<sup>4</sup> The Russian decorations, including their various classes, the imperial monograms, and the so-called buckles indicating the years of service, number about sixty. Sometimes twenty marks of distinction glitter on one uniform.—M.

<sup>5</sup> The Russians' affectionate title for their Tsar

<sup>6</sup> A few years ago one of the court officials cut his throat because at some court function he was assigned a lower place than he was entitled to according to the hierarchy. He was the Vatel of Russian Officialdom.—M.

Vatel, steward of "the great Condé," committed suicide in 1671, heart-broken over some deficiencies in a banquet and entertainment held in honour of Louis XIV.

But to their country palaces they flee  
 And write from there to the high chamberlain.  
 A royal mistress, or a lady friend—  
 The liberals to a coachman may unbend.  
 And slowly they gain favour once again.—  
 Thus will a dog, thrown from the window, die,  
 A cat miaows but on its feet alights,  
 Seeks out once more a path to enter by,  
 Crawls through some hole and reasserts its rights.  
 The stoic, ere he win the royal smile,  
 Talks to his friends with democratic guile.

The Tsar's gold-collared uniform is green,  
 Without a uniform he ne'er is seen.  
 'Tis as his hide—without it he were flayed.  
 Thus many Tsars have flourished—and decayed.

When from the cradle crawls a future Tsar,  
 The babe is gorgeous from that very day  
 In jackets fit for cossack or hussar,  
 And has small whips and sabres for his play  
 Learning to spell, he flourishes the blade,  
 And indicates the letters with its aid.  
 When tutored in the dances of the Court,  
 He waves a tiny rhythmic whip in sport <sup>7</sup>  
 As he grows up, it is his great delight  
 In his own room to drill a little squad,  
 Command them to the left and to the right,  
 And train them for review—and for the rod.

Thus every youthful Tsar has learned to rule  
 Hence Europe fears and praises them. How fine  
 To men of yore seemed our Krasicki's<sup>8</sup> line:  
 "The sage was right, but strength was with the fool!"  
 May mighty Peter's lustre ne'er grow dim:

<sup>7</sup> In the Hermitage, the St Petersburg picture gallery, is a portrait of the Tsarevich, heir to the throne. The painter, an Englishman named Dawe, has portrayed him as a child in a hussar's uniform, with a whip in his hand.—M.

George Dawe (1781-1829) was the court painter of Alexander I and Nicholas I.

<sup>8</sup> Ignacy Krasicki (1735-1801) was the greatest Polish poet of the eighteenth century.

This wise Tsaropædia<sup>9</sup> sprang from him !  
He laid out for the Tsars the road to fame,  
Seeing the styles on which wise Europe dotes,  
He said : " This great land I will make the same,  
I will shave beards and trim off lengthy coats."  
He spoke : boyars'<sup>10</sup> and princelings' skirts straightway  
Were clipped as garden hedges are in France  
He spoke : muzhiks' and merchants' beards that day  
Poured down like leaves on which the hailstones dance  
Great Peter ordered drums and bayonets,  
Erected prisons, trained troops of cadets.  
He introduced the minuet at Court,  
Forced highborn dames to grace society,  
Strengthened his frontiers stretched from sea to sea,  
And with a chain closed up each Russian port.  
He formed a senate ; he established spies,  
Passports, and ranks, he farmed the spirit-tax.  
He washed the peasants, shaved them, clad their backs,  
Armed them, and filled their pockets with supplies  
Of roubles, so that Europe cried, surprised :  
" Tsar Peter has made Russia civilised ! "  
All that remained for later Tsars' desires  
Was to hint lies to venal Cabinets,  
To succour despots with new bayonets,  
To instigate some massacres and fires,  
To enter foreign lands on plunder bent,  
To pay their foreign guests a stolen fee,  
And win applause in France and Germany,  
And to appear a strong, wise government.

Wait, French and Germans, but a short time more !  
When in your ears the Tsar's ukases roar,  
When on your bent necks hails of knout-blows fly,  
When flames from your fair cities light the sky,  
Then will you cease to praise and to adore.  
When bade to worship with becoming grace,

<sup>9</sup> The Greek historian Xenophon wrote a work called the *Cyropædia* (*The Education of Cyrus*), in which he gives his ideal of the training of a good and wise ruler. Mickiewicz parodies the title in his *Caropedyä* (the Polish spelling), *The Education of a Tsar*.

<sup>10</sup> " Boyar " and " muzhik " are the Russian words for *noble* and *peasant*. Used by Mickiewicz they add a Muscovite flavour to the passage.

Siberia, kibitka,<sup>11</sup> knout, ukase,  
 You then, perchance, will seek to entertain  
 The Tsar with a more modern, stern refrain.

Between the ranks the Tsar, a bowling-ball,  
 Rushed in, enquiring of the health of all.  
 "We wish you health," his warriors whisper low.  
 A hundred bears might growl and rumble so.  
 An order slipped between his teeth and dropped,  
 Intact, upon the high commander's tongue,  
 Then forth from lip to lip the word was flung,  
 And, falling on a far-off sergeant, stopped.  
 Then sabres clattered, firearms clicked and groaned;  
 The square, like troubled waters, surged and moaned.  
 Whoe'er has seen, upon a man-of-war,  
 A huge iron kettle used for making mush,  
 When from a pump great jets of water gush  
 Into it, while a group of sailors pour  
 The meal from four stout casks, and paddles dance,  
 Stirring the mixture till it seethes with glee,  
 Whoe'er has seen the Deputies in France,<sup>12</sup>  
 An hundred times more turbulent and free,  
 When in their midst a project has been cast  
 And the debating hour is drawing nigh:  
 All Europe, starved from a protracted fast,  
 Thinks freedoms will be fed her ere she die;  
 From mouths, like pumps, new liberalisms sluice!  
 Someone at first suggests our Christian creed,  
 The Chamber, growing noisy, will not heed:  
 Somebody mentions freedom; 'tis no use!  
 Someone at last brings up the sad abuse  
 Of helpless peoples, Tsars, a despot's reign;  
 "Order," the wearied Chamber shouts again.  
 The Finance Minister runs in at last  
 With a well-pruned new budget to be passed;  
 Begins a speech that sounds of great import,  
 On duties, rates, red tape of varied sort.  
 The Chamber boils and bubbles, spurts and cries,

<sup>11</sup> Waggon, here one used for the transportation of exiles

<sup>12</sup> The following passage is based on Mickiewicz's own impressions of his visits to the French Chamber of Deputies. He writes in a similar vein in a short article, *New Approval of the Alien Bill in France*, published in *The Polish Pilgrim* for 5 April, 1833

And casts its hubbub to the very skies  
Nations take comfort; Cabinets take fright,  
Till they perceive, with an embarrassed blush,  
'Twas naught but taxes caused this verbal flight —  
Whoe'er has seen that kettle full of mush,  
Or that wild Chamber, he will understand  
What turmoil rose in that vast soldier-throng  
When into it was flung the Tsar's command.  
Three hundred drums responded loud and long,  
And like the Neva's ice that cracks and drifts,  
Into long columns falls the infantry.  
Rank after rank advances solidly,  
While each commander his great voice uplifts  
The Tsar stands like the sun, the regiments  
Revolve like planets on the heavenly stage  
The Tsar lets loose a pack of adjutants,  
Like dogs from leash or sparrows from a cage :  
Madly they shout commands and madly ride,  
Official voices rise on every side,  
The bass drums bark, musicians pule and whine.  
Now anchor-cable-wise the infantry  
Unwinds and whips out to a cordlike line,  
By regiments the walls of cavalry  
Advance and form a rampart-like design.

But what bold, fierce manœuvres then took place :  
How the fleet cavalry, like conquerors,  
Flew toward the infantry at furious pace,  
As, when the trumpet sounds, a pack of curs  
Attacks a bear tied in a baiting-ring,  
Emboldened that a rope its snout confines;  
And how the infantry, now shrivelling,  
Put forth its arms, as startled porcupines,  
To awe a growling dog, advance their spines;  
How the mad cavalry, with great furore,  
Reined sharply in, stopped short of the attack;  
And how they trundled cannons up and back;  
How both in Russian and in French they swore;  
How this man won arrest and that a blow;  
How others froze and sank down in the snow,  
And how the Tsar won plaudits with his show—  
I feel the fruitful richness of the theme !

I need but sing it to win great esteem;  
But like a bomb, my poor muse, in mid-flight,  
Falls and expires in rhythm as dull as prose,  
And in the midst of that stupendous sight,  
Like Homer when the gods fall out, I doze!

By now all the manœuvres had occurred  
Whereof the Tsar had ever read or heard.  
The uproar of spectators had grown less:  
Now topcoat, fur coat, uniform, and dress  
That had showed black around the close-packed square  
Were crawling slowly homeward unobserved.  
The place retained a frozen, wearied air;  
And in the palace lunch was being served.

Foreign ambassadors from near and far,  
Who, paying boredom and the frost small heed,  
Always attend reviews to please the Tsar,  
Exclaiming "Marvels! miracles!" at need,  
Already the two-thousandth time had cried  
(The ardour new, the compliments antique)  
That in his tactics was the Tsar unique,  
That he had mighty leaders by his side,  
That who had not beheld could ne'er be told  
The fire and courage of these warriors bold.  
The conversations ended with a sneer  
At arrogant Napoleon's career.  
Then each man sought his watch with furtive eye,  
Fearing more trots and gallops might be nigh;  
For the sub-zero coldness pinched and gripped,  
And ennui strangled them, and hunger nipped.

But still the Tsar gives orders to repeat;  
His gray and black and yellow cavalry  
Full twenty times he has advance, retreat;  
He makes once more a wall of soldiery,  
Once more compresses it into a square,  
And once more spreads it fanwise on the snow;  
As an old gamester still with loving care  
Stacks, shuffles, deals to an imagined foe:  
Although he is deserted and ignored,  
He watches and enjoys how each card falls.  
But e'en the Tsar himself at last was bored,

Turned sharp and hid among his generals.  
When he had left, the army held its pose,  
And for some minutes stood and slowly froze,  
Until at last the drums and trumpets spoke.  
Two hundred columns, horse and foot, awoke,  
Flowed into near-by streets and sank from view.—  
How changed they were, how totally unlike  
Those rushing Alpine streams of turbid hue  
That leap from crags and roar and twist and strike,  
To meet within the placid lake's bright breast :  
There they will purify themselves and rest,  
Then glitter gently in new beds and roll  
Their emerald waters toward some distant goal.<sup>13</sup>  
These soldiers entered fresh and strong and white ;  
They went out drenched with sweat, a sorry sight :  
Exhausted, blackened with the melted snows,  
Soiled with the mud that from the ice-cracks rose

Now actors and spectators both had fled,  
And in the lonely square remained the dead,  
Twenty in all. This white-clad one, you know,  
Was from the cavalry ; you cannot guess  
The sort and colour of that other's dress,  
So crushed he is and trampled in the snow.  
Some, standing column-like before the lines,  
Have frozen, pointing out the Tsar's designs ;  
For a mistake this wretch endured the pain  
Of gun-butt blow and fell among the slain.  
Servants of the police collect them all,  
And give them, hurt or slain, one burial.  
This lad had broken ribs ; a cannon-wheel  
Had torn that other's flesh and crushed his bones :  
His bloody entrails stained the muddy stones ;  
Thrice he screamed out an agonised appeal.  
" Be still, you fool ! " his major cried aloud ;  
" The Tsar observes us ! " Terrified and cowed,  
He clenched his teeth. They brought a cloak in haste  
To cover him. For when the Tsar is faced  
With sudden death so early in the day,  
And empty-stomached, sees flesh streaming red,

<sup>13</sup> The figure was probably suggested to Mickiewicz by his own memories of Switzerland.



Courtiers observe he seems no longer gay,  
But seeks the palace cross and vexed instead.  
There they await him that the Court may eat,  
But he retains no appetite for meat.

The last poor chap set everyone agog ·  
Let this man threaten him or that man flog,  
He dared oppose his august general,  
And, groaning loudly, cursed the very Tsar !  
A crowd, surprised by the unwonted brawl,  
Pushed toward this hero-martyr from afar  
He bore the leader's orders, says report,  
And like a steed bewitched his horse stopped short.  
While charging squadrons galloped from behind.  
Both horse and rider pitched into the road,  
While over them the living torrent flowed.  
But horses are less vicious than mankind :  
As over him the racing troopers flew,  
One horse just struck him with its iron shoe  
And broke his upper arm. The jagged bone  
Pierced through his uniform and could be seen  
As white as any corpse against the green.  
His face was livid, but he made no moan  
Nor lost his strength · now heavenward he raised  
His other arm, and summoning the throng  
That on his tortured features gaped and gazed,  
With earnest voice he counselled them full long.  
And what about ? No one dares say a word.  
For fear of spies his startled hearers fled  
And to their questioners discreetly said  
That only broken Russian had they heard,  
But that indeed one phrase had carried far :  
" The Tsar, the Tsar,"—something about the Tsar.  
Reports were current that the trampled man  
Was but a lad, a Lithuanian,  
The scion of a house both proud and great ;  
That from his school he had been seized by force ;  
That the commander, with accustomed hate,  
Had said, on giving him an untamed horse,  
" Now let the Polish cur beware his fate ! "

They knew not who he was, and from that time  
Men spake not of the name but of the crime.

Ah, when they search thy conscience, Tsar, to find  
That name, no more recalled by humankind,  
The devil will reveal it amid throngs  
Whom thou hast cast 'neath horses or confined  
In mines, to blot them out and hide their wrongs.

Upon the morrow from the square were heard  
A dog's dull howls—A black patch stained the white.  
When men dug down, the corpse was disinterred  
Of some poor fellow who had died that night  
Half peasant and half soldier he appeared,  
With close-cropped head but with a long, full beard;  
He wore an army coat, a cap of fur,  
And seemed the servant of some officer  
Upon his master's cloak of fur, slumped low,  
Awaiting orders, he was left to freeze,  
And now the drifting snow had reached his knees.  
His faithful dog had sought and found him so.  
He dared not use the cloak, so cruelly nigh,  
To keep from freezing! Snow concealed one eye,  
The other, open though congealed, was cast  
Upon the square. thence had his master passed!  
His Lord has bade him sit, he will obey,  
And, ordered to be still, will move no limb,  
Nor rise until the awful Judgment Day,  
Keeping in death the faith reposed in him.  
For still he grasped the garment jealously,  
To guard it from whatever thieves might be  
His other hand he warmed within his breast,  
But clutched the cloak with fingers swollen and bare.  
His lord made no inquiry and no quest:  
He was too cautious, or he did not care!  
He was some officer on tour, they said,  
A new arrival in the capital,  
Who went not to parades on duty's call,  
But to display fresh epaulettes instead.  
Perchance a dinner followed the review,  
A lady's wink that his trained eye had caught,  
A call upon a gamester whom he knew,  
And o'er the cards—his serf escaped his thought.  
Perchance both coat and man he would disown  
In order not to show he had a cloak

And could not stand the cold like other folk,  
While tsarish flesh endured without a groan:  
The world would say: "To the review he brought  
A coat! How odd! A liberal in thought!"

Poor peasant! Such dumb, patient bravery  
Is merit in a dog but sin for thee!  
And thy reward? Thy lord will smile and say  
That, dog-like, unto death thou didst obey.  
Poor peasant! Why should tears flow forth from me,  
And my heart throb when I recall thy fate?  
Poor Slav, I grieve for thine unhappy state!  
Poor nation, I deplore thy tragedy!  
Thy heroism is naught but slavery.

# VERSES

*Translated from the Russian of PUSHKIN by*

R. T. ATTRIDGE

There blooms a wond'rous crimson rose,  
     Divine, in sumptuous glory drest.  
 Before Citheron still it blows,  
     Ever by lovely Venus blest.  
 Paphos is struck by frosty breath,  
     Citheron's glory fades away;  
 But still she blooms, defying death,  
     Among the roses of a day.

*Translated from the Russian of FET by R. T. ATTRIDGE and*

W. A. MORISON<sup>1</sup>

Whispered words, and timid breathing.  
     Nightingale a-trill  
 Silver sheen and sleepy ripple  
     Of the dreamy rill.  
 Gleams of night, and darkling shadows,—  
     Shadows without end.  
 Changes of a dear expression  
     With enchantment blend.  
 Misty cloudlets red as roses,  
     Shades from amber drawn,  
 Lips that meet, and tears that glisten,  
     And the dawn, the dawn ! . . .

<sup>1</sup> Another translation of these verses was published in this *Review*, Vol. XVI, No. 47, p. 290.

## THE DEATH OF KHAN KRUM

*Translated from the Bulgarian of A. KARALIYCHEV by*

W. A. MORISON

ON the fourteenth of July, 814, in the six thousand three hundred and twenty-second year after the creation of the world, Krum, the great Khan of the Bulgars, fell from his horse as he was riding into his old palace at Pliska, and let his head sink into the hands of the wise kavkhan Ishbul.

The day was hot and still. A white cloud sailed like a hope over the burnt, cracked Danube plain. Like a poisoned arrow sunstroke pierced the dread lord's hardened heart. Thick black blood stained his lips. Scarce had he fallen on the grass, than from the ashen sky there swooped a great white eagle—the god Ikush—and hung low over the heads of the startled nobles. Hurriedly they dismounted from their horses. The eagle spread its snow-white wings and, fluttering above the Khan's head, as larks flutter at sunset, hid the light of the sun. A cool shade breathed on the dying man's brow. One of the horses neighed in fright, and the echo of its cry sped to the leaf-hid palace; then silence fell once more.

A brittle, exhausted butterfly tried to alight on the sun-baked iron helmet, singed itself, and tumbled on the grass. Its thin legs stirred.

With wide-open, dreadful eyes Krum gazed on his war-chiefs, and his lips whispered darkly:

"Where is my son, the kanar Omurtag? Send for him. . . ."

"Lord," replied the kavkhan Ishbul, "the kanar Omurtag and the zhupan of the Kurigars, the one-armed Okhshun, set out this morning for the forest to chase the wild boar."

"Darkness is descending upon my eyes. . . Who is it hides the sun from me? Someone has quenched my sight," whispered the Khan once more. "I wish to see my son ere I surrender my soul to the talons of the god Ikush. Where is he? Why is he not here?"

The Khan raised his head, gazed long with his dulling eyes on the gloomy faces of his courtiers, and then turned them once more to the ground. Slowly they closed.

"Kavkhan Ishbul, when my golden son returns, place on his head my crown, put in his hands the key of my treasury, and this sharp spear, the banner of the Bulgars. . . ."

The Khan's blackened fist sought in the grass for the fallen spear, and could not find it. His yellow fingers grasped at a clump of green blades and uprooted them.

"Tell him . . ." he continued; but before he could finish his command the god Ikush spread his wings, settled on the fallen man's breast, seized with his talons the spirit of the great Khan Krum, and bore it up into the ashen sky, just as his comrades the black eagles bore away lambs from the flocks, or new-born foals from the horse-droves that grazed by the palace.

The eagle shot straight up, and soon began to be lost to sight. The kavkhan Ishbul gnawed his lips, and with frozen gaze followed the ravished soul. When it had vanished, the faithful old chieftain, his right hand still on Krum, drew from his belt a sharp dagger, grasped its black handle, raised it resolutely, and with its blade began to hack at his face. Warm blood spurted from the wound, and sprinkled the fierce kavkhan's coat of mail. The nobles imitated their war-chief, fiercely gashing their faces. The kavkhan Ishbul watched them, and his grief grew more intense. It pressed down on him like a millstone. He uttered a roar like a wild boar pierced by a spear. Bending down, he tore at the ground with his nails, gathered a handful of earth, and sprinkled it on his head. The nobles did the same. Their iron-sheathed backs gleamed as they bent to the ground.

"Have a waggon fetched, that we may convey the dead Khan into the palace. Send mounted messengers to the four corners of the Bulgar land. Let them swiftly announce to the people that the Khan is dead. The new Khan will give an eshmedeme; yea, a great feast will he give! And he will distribute largess; Greek pieces of gold, Greek silver will he scoop with a bushel from the royal treasury. Let the messengers announce this to the people. Let all the chieftains swiftly appear at the palace of the Khan. Let the young Khan be sought out!"

The blood-stained immik, commander of the cavalry, sprang to horse, and sped swifter than the wind across the yellow meadows towards the cool forest of Madar. Mares that were grazing untrammelled in the meadows turned their heads, scanned the horseman, and set out in greedy pursuit of the sweat-bathed stallion.

The nobles divided into two companies. The first company hurried to the fortress on the crags of Madar, where the army was in camp and the summer palace of Khan Krum gleamed white. The other band turned their horses' heads in at the palace gate.

The kavkhan Ishbul remained alone with the Khan. The sun scorched the face of the dead man, who was gazing upwards with eyes open on eternity. Ishbul knelt down, raised a shield to give him shade, looked into the peaceful face of the man who had been the terror of the Greeks and the god of the Bulgars, and sighed deeply :

"So many years have I eaten at thy table! . . . 'Twas to me thou ever gavest the first piece of meat. Khan Krum!" cried the kavkhan, and received no answer. Tears trickled down his black skin, and mingled with the blood from the fresh wound. . . .

Before plunging into the deep forest, among oaks with creviced bark and golden moss, the imnik drew out his white bull's horn, bound with two silver rings, and sounded it hoarsely three times. Then he raised his head and listened, holding his breath. The ancient forest swallowed the voice of the horn, echoing strangely. Yellow birds stirred among the leaves, twittered, spread their wings and sped off in the heavy silence. From somewhere in the depths, far away, like the voice of a bird, came the sound of another horn. It was the kanar Omurtag replying. The imnik rode into the shadow of the ancient trees. A slim-legged roe with dark, startled eyes passed in front of the horse, and fled like a vision between the tree-trunks. The horseman did not stay to reach for an arrow from his quiver, but spurred on his horse, anxious to reach the place whence had come the voice of Omurtag's horn. Low branches struck him in the face. At length he emerged on a bright forest-clearing, bathed in the whisper of a silver stream. Before him were the young hunters; bare to the waist, seated on the carcass of a huge boar, talking and laughing and drinking from a pot the mead which the old Bulgars named sidzhu. The one-armed zhupan sprang forward with glowing eyes to meet the imnik.

"Dost bring good news, bird in flight?"

"May the gods," began the imnik with shaking voice, "may the gods grant that the young Khan live a hundred years, that he may conquer the lands of a hundred powerful kings, and that the keys of the oaken gates of a hundred capitals may ring on his quiver!"

Suddenly Omurtag turned white as linen, and the smile died on his lips. He stood up, and the pot of mead shook in his hand. His golden bracelets jangled. He questioned:

"I am the kanar, not the Khan. Where is my father?"

"Khan Krum has departed to the heavenly palace of the god Tengri."

Omurtag dropped the pot. It fell on one of the shields and smashed. The liquid mingled with the blood of the slaughtered boar.

"Give me thy horse," he said to the innik. "My own broke its leg this day. I knew it foreboded ill. Come, Okhshun!"

And springing furiously to horse, Omurtag rode fast for Pliska. He left behind his coat of mail, his shield, his spear and his bow. At his waist swung naught but a short sword. Fallen branches cracked dully under the hoof. Dewdrops of sweat burst out on the rider's bronzed back. When he emerged from the forest the sun was trembling low over the plain, and the trees cast giant shadows. Close at hand sheep-bells spilled their tinkling. An old shepherd in a heavy woollen cap, with bow and arrows and a whole drove of dead partridges tied by the legs and thrown over his shoulder, was leading his flock homewards. Two black curs sprang out from the flock and dashed after the horseman. The shepherd whistled, and the dogs at once halted. The swift steed sped towards the meadows, and the mares, as soon as they sighted him, again turned eager heads. He shot through the drove and plunged down towards Pliska.

Krum's son could scarcely make his way through the throng that was hurrying from all directions towards the palace, with terrible cries bewailing the death of the Khan. In the spacious throne-room, on the walls of which there hung on hooks the crowns, swords, helmets, shields and armour of the vanquished kings and nobles of the whole Balkan Peninsula, on the royal couch, supported on the backs of four raging lions cast in pure silver, the dead Khan lay. His son entered, yellow as a crag bathed in moonlight, fell upon the couch, and did not stir the whole night long. Three times the cock crew. Another day dawned. The sun flashed through a window and gilded the heads of the dead man and the living. Krum's frozen eyelids quivered, and an enigmatic smile played about his lips. The morning bugles sounded above the fortress. A flock of snow-white pigeons scattered about the roof of the palace.

There arrived, mounted upon swift, slim-legged mares, tarkans and komits from Moesia, Thrace and the mountains of Macedonia. In bands arrived all the princes who ruled the countless villages of the Empire. They dismounted from their horses, took them by the bridles, and led them about the sandy paths in the Khan's gardens, gazing with astonished eyes at the fabulous marble palace, marvelling at the columns of alabaster, stretching their black hands



towards the fountains that spurted under the trees, towards the mild doves pecking at the sand. Towards evening there rode up, two black wings on his shoulders such as the ancient Germans wore, the commander of the new lands beyond the Danube. To the West the new lands marched with the empire of Charles the Great. All made way for him

The court-yard of the Khan's palace grew dark. On the trees were hung weapons and leather bags. The chiefs of Krum's wide empire came in coats of mail woven from iron, in armour skilfully fashioned of bone, in the sinewy hides of slaughtered beasts. On their heads they wore dusty, sharp-tipped helmets. The beards of the Slavs were ruddy, while the short, stocky Bulgars wore thin Mongolian moustaches that hung straight down. Each had a broad silver quiver, a short heavy sword on the left hip and a horse-tail on the right. This horse-tail was the ensign of the old Bulgars. It served as a symbol of high distinction, and was given personally by the Khan to those who had gone into battle at least ten times

The court-yard resounded with the noise of a herd of boars crashing through dense forest. Shouting and stamping filled the streets of Pliska.

Voices were heard :

"Let the young Khan come forth ! We wish to see him in the flesh, with our own eyes !"

The kavkhan Ishbul, who had been standing with his back against a pillar watching the pulsating throng, mounted the staircase and entered the palace. Quietly he crossed the empty hall, his footsteps lost in the soft Cashmere carpet. Touching the lad on his bare shoulder, he said :

"Dost hear, O Khan ? The tarkans have come, they who rule the provinces ; the komits have come, they who rule the districts ; the princes of the Slav villages and settlements have come ; all the nobles and chieftains are gathered together. The commander of the Avar lands is here. With great wings he has come ! They wish thee to appear before them."

Omurtag arose and slowly went outside. When he appeared on the threshold, between the two black columns of the main doorway, there was dead silence for a moment. The military commanders fell on their knees like mown grass. Their swords clanged on the flagstones.

"Welcome !" said the lad quietly. "Welcome to the palace of my father ! He has gone above, and will no longer come forth

to meet you Never forget Khan Krum! Do ye hear?" His voice shook.

The kneeling men began to rub their eyes with their palms. Then from the palace, behind the back of the Khan's young son, footsteps were heard. Omurtag turned round. And as after the passing of a heavy, rain-charged cloud the spring sky grows bright and limpid, like a great fragrant flower, so did Omurtag's young soul grow serene when he saw that the oldest tarkan, he of Cherven, was approaching, bearing in his right hand the jewelled crown of Khan Krum. In his left hand the old man held the key of the treasury, and the spear which the dread Khan, lover of battles, had once raised aloft as he set out with his warriors for the South.

"Till now thou hast been the kanar, supreme judge of the Bulgars, he who lets blood and with it signs treaties with the friends and foes of the Bulgar people," began the white-haired tarkan of Cherven. "Henceforth thou art our father, our protector and Khan. Take this crown. May it warm thy young brow. Till last night it girt the head of a ruler who was lord of Bulgars and Slavs, Avars and Magyars, as far as the land of the Franks and the walls of Constantine's city. The dead Khan once washed his feet in three seas. How precious a crown I give thee! Thou art chosen by the gods!"

Khan Omurtag took the crown, and as soon as he placed it on his head the military commanders leapt to their feet, drew their swords, raised them aloft, and gave the oath of loyalty. The gleam of their weapons dazzled the new Khan.

"Take the key of the Khan's treasury, my son," continued the tarkan, "and may thy hand after battle and during the great celebrations be ever generous, as was the hand of thy father who has gone. Man, however well he may live on earth, dies; however much wealth he may amass, loses it. There remain unperishing naught but a famous name, and the memory of great deeds. Distribute, Lord, thy earthly riches to thy warriors, and do thou think on the eternal glory that victories bring."

Khan Omurtag put out his hand to receive the key.

"Here, too, is the spear of dread Krum. All his life he held this sharp spear pointed against the gates of the palace of Vlakhern, set with precious stones and with figures of molten gold. The gods did not grant him one year more, that he might pierce with it the gate of the impregnable tower. Khan Omurtag, it is now thy turn!"

The lad in the crown glanced over the heads of the sunburnt men, and his gaze went far beyond the tops of the blue forest. Before him arose a tall stone wall lined with warriors. Behind the wall gleamed gilded towers and the cupolas of churches with yellow crosses. Tall silver poplars swayed. Great bells pealed. . . . Suddenly the earth gave forth a hollow sound, the wall collapsed, its defenders scattered with the cries of fledgelings into whose nest a snake has crawled, and the towers and cupolas were laid bare in all their sublimity. A young Khan on a black Mongol horse sprang over the ruins of the overturned wall and dashed along an empty avenue. Behind him, with bared swords and shouts which made the earth tremble, like a torrent swept the black-visaged horsemen. When they reached the wonderful gateway, the Khan raised his spear and hurled it. . . .

Somewhere a horn sounded mournfully. The taltosh, the high priest, was summoning the soul of the dead Khan to return among his people from the heavenly kingdom of Tengri, and to abide with them for seven days, the space of the celebrations

Omurtag awoke from his day-dream. The vision had vanished. He waved his hand in a wide gesture, and said

“Enough! Dig a tomb for the dead Khan.”

Noise burst out afresh.

In the garden, under the sacred tree whose fruits none but the late Khan had tasted, they dug a deep grave, and at its very bottom laid two thick oak boards. These boards were the bridge over which the soul would pass, after the lesser celebrations, from life on earth to eternal joy and bliss without end. Over this bridge, too, the soul would descend once more when after three months the taltosh should summon it to the celebration of the great feast. Upon the boards they let down the coffin with the mortal remains of the Khan. To construct this marvellous coffin Krum had summoned an artisan from a distant land, and as soon as the work was completed he had ordered the man to be beheaded, that its like might never be fashioned. By the coffin they set out the weapons of all the kings Khan Krum had defeated in countless battles. Here were marvellous crowns, swords in scabbards set with pearls, helmets which warmed and illuminated the gloomy grave, broken spears with golden tips, bows that not every man born of woman could bend, coats of mail, shields. And at the head of the coffin they set the silver cup which the Khan's goldsmiths had fashioned in the year 811 from the skull of the Greek emperor Nikephoros,

that the dead man might drink from it a heavenly draught, having for three years drunk sidzhu from it at the feasts

They buried the coffin and the treasure under moist earth, piled a lofty tomb above the grave. Then they dispatched a herald to inquire of the folk, who had gathered like a river in flood by the stone wall of the palace, what young lads desired to be interred together with the Khan. For the old Bulgars believed that the Khan's tomb was Paradise.

Before the sanctuary of the taltosh, as evening fell, there appeared five young lads from Moesia. It was from Moesia that the Bulgar Khans recruited their truest warriors, those who always fought in the first ranks. The taltosh anointed the doomed men with sweet-smelling oil, and clothed them in white garments. From the palace five white horses were led. Mounted on the white horses, the lads rode into the precincts of the palace, turned off towards the gardens, and began to gallop around the tomb.

It grew darker. The lords and priests, following the mounted Moesians with gleaming eyes, loomed black. Night opened wide its jaws and swallowed up the tomb. When the moon appeared above the wattle fence and lit up the white horsemen, they already looked like apparitions from the other world, where all is white and unearthly.

Till midnight the Moesians rode round the moonlit tomb. And when the fiery eye of Tengri rose to the middle of the sky the taltosh made a sign, and the Khan's nobles drew their swords and closed in on the riders from all sides. They cut off their heads, slew their horses too, and buried them just as they lay about the grave. The tomb grew to terrible proportions. In silence the warriors piled earth all night long, until they had covered the top of the sacred tree.

Next morning began the eshmedeme, the lesser celebration, of which mention is made in the stone inscriptions.

## THE MYSTIC ROSE

*Translated from the Polish of EWA ŁUSKINA by*  
DOROTHY F. TAIT

The forests asked: when will night come, and with it sleep and dreams?

Sunset had already come, amber and perfumed, the wild swans were flying belatedly to their nests.

Roch, the man of God, was kneeling on a fragment of rock, himself as motionless as the rock. A hare pursued by a vixen flew to safety under the folds of his habit; a dark-sapphire swallow circled rapidly above his uplifted open hands; carefully, as if to lay an egg in them as in a nest, a heavily laden forest-bee returning to the hive sealed up his ear with wax; a spider dropped down low to spin a web on his lips, which were parted in the ecstasy of his heart.

"Ave Maria . . ."

A misty dusk had already fallen, swallowing up the resinous exhalations of the sun-warmed woods.

Light gusts carried their pure, bitter breath, the breath of dark pines and swiftly eddying streams foaming in gullies in the riven earth, among heaths and mouldering pine needles.

Roch, the man of God, returned by the stony path to his hut at the foot of the rock, roughly constructed of brushwood and clay.

There his days and nights were spent, devoted to the virile joy of penitent solitude. The splinter of pine wood thrust into the wall fitfully lit up the sole furniture, a poor plank bed and a table.

Roch set on the table two wooden bowls filled with plant-milk and spring water; he pulled from his bosom a bundle of roots; on the fresh leaves he laid a comb dripping with dark honey.

Immediately a red squirrel jumped down from a rafter to get his tribute, a handful of green nuts. From the corner came a long-drawn bleating, and the bearded face of a goat looked out with friendly eyes.

He pushed a truss of fresh grass towards her, then sat down quietly to eat the one meal of his day

"Man of God."

Roch started and bent forward, as if a deadly shaft had pierced him.

In the opening of the hut stood a slender devil-may-care youth in the garb of a troubadour.

"Will you receive under your roof one who has lost his way?"

"Come in, sir."

Into the beam of light which alternated with the shadow the unknown stepped, and halted. A fallen cherub, with a madness of pride on his pale forehead, which was crowned with a golden chaplet.

Roch's hands began to search for support, his legs shook and swayed like frail reeds in the wind.

"Do you know me?" asked the guest. "I will tell you from whence you know me."

He advanced boldly and sat down on a corner of the plank bed.

"Do you remember, monk? The battles of flowers and the troubadour's tournament at the court of the Duke of Naples? The transparent darkness of the orange groves, the spring green of the myrtles, the charming sea-greens of the young larches, the gay colours, the bright tones, the meadows of delicate greenery growing over the crumbling stone lions with the coats of arms in their paws?"

"The brotherhood of love, the 'Galois', was setting up the Courts of Love, Boccacio was reading his *Amorosa visione* from narrow strips of parchment. A closed garden of pleasure and art—in the midst of a town transformed into a garden of death. Until on a sudden a terrible guest crossed the flower-decked walls, which defied him with the smiles of a thousand women and thousands of roses—the Black Death.

"And in his wake you monks came, wearing dirty habits and carrying torches and loathsome hooks, to lay on the young men's silk-mailed breasts, and on the dovelike bosoms of the maidens, and to rend their hearts. In the dust of your steps trailed the young heads of the women in their costly veils and the little heads of the maidens in their nets of silk and pearls, which not long before had shone like scattered *amoretti* among the lacy darkness of the trees. Do you remember, monk?"

Roch nodded.

"And do you remember, monk, an unknown troubadour who carried away all the prizes in the tournament of poetry? A golden violet for the ode, silver acacia for the *ballade*, a jasmine flower for the *pastourelle*; and who alone bore off the triumphal trophy from the sport with death, his young and undaunted head . . . ? Did you see me?"

Roch dissented. In the shadow a baleful gleam flashed like the glitter of the pupils of a lurking panther, but perhaps it was only the gleam of the topaz in the dagger hilt of the mysterious guest.

"But you were seen, servant of the plague," rang out the undaunted reply.

But immediately the voice of the unknown changed, and struck into that pure gold tone which pierced the heart of the hermit with trembling and foreboding.

"Consider, monk, whether in truth you have never seen me."

## II.

The quiet monastery of the Friars Minor. A court-yard in a walled quadrangle over which climbed capriolum and wild vine—old, fragrant, many-branched lime-trees—summer.

A cistern walled with planks, on it some earthenware flower-pots, rusty iron goblets fastened by chains, from which the poor and the bright-plumaged pigeons came to quench their thirst.

Roch recalled the dalliance of these pigeons, the faint drowsiness of the hen-bird, who lay with her outstretched claws looking like pink sugar, while the male bird hovered around with loving cooing, his neck glittering with a rainbow ruff.

A young lay brother was walking away as quickly as the heavy buckets of water permitted. They bent his shoulders, which were still weak and youthful.

Then came wrestling in prayer, a sacred and stern rite, in the darkness of Byzantine chapels; long hours of nocturnal vigil on the knees, until it was as if drops of bloody tears began to fly through the air, until faintness would break his limbs and his tongue would cleave to his palate with dryness.

A pause. Already there was a glimmer of light in his eyes, the twinkling of the whitest stars; already his face was somehow at peace like a quiet flower.

At that moment Satan struck out with darkness, as if with congealed blood and gall. Abhorrence struck his breast like a wave, the girdle of St. Francis sank into his body as if it had cut him in two. Then the monk beat out with his hands like a fish wounded in the fin, a bloody froth broke out on his lips, and without a groan he crashed, arms outstretched, on the stone floor of the church. He carried some marvel in his soul, he awaited a revelation.

But although the spirit was mighty, the flesh was weak; and despondency, like some maggot, slowly began to penetrate his heart.

For days on end he wandered about the cloisters of the church and the corridors of the monastery, which were full of Byzantine wood carvings, covered with costly robes, as if to hide monstrously

distorted limbs, and with insipid pictures with no nuances of colouring, naked and unashamed

Figures of the Saviour tortured him in every corner—His body as it were broken on the wheel, in a mantle of His own blood; the crown of thorns thrust into His eyes; a greenish pus spouting in an arc from His opened side.

Here pictures of Madonnas, gaunt, black and terrible, with heads compressed into gold circlets, with round owl's eyes, with the Child in their arms, its limbs swollen as by dropsy.

Poor Roch gazed, and an ever more oppressive gloom forced its way into his soul; prayers died away on the lips of this simple man who longed to see the ideal his heart adored set up visibly before his own eyes and the eyes of the whole world.

Until one day he seized a piece of coal from the fireplace and on the bare wall of his cell sketched the first outlines of the picture *Maiden of Maidens*. The poor monk, creator by the grace of God, did not know what he was doing.

A few years passed, and the passages and cloisters of the church were covered with idealistic frescoes. A few more years, and the fame of the modest monk sped with brazen and golden clang far beyond the walls of the monastery. A few more, and alongside his models goldsmiths began to make their sacred vessels and weavers to arrange the threads for their tapestries; great lords and princes began to entrust to him their psalters and missals, so that he could set his masterly illuminations on their pages.

And one day—

A litter made of golden olive-wood brought to the threshold of the monastery the first dignitary in the country and a woman, a unique woman, before whom, at her companion's command, the rude folding doors opened.

She entered, and with her entered a miracle.

She entered, like a simple Nazarene maiden, in golden Bactrian linen, as the soul of Roch saw her in a kind of first-moment shiver, and then lost her, like Paradise.

The monk stood before her, motionless as a statue, his hands and feet hidden in his black habit, his forehead shaded by his cowl, at his feet a pot of lilies and in his heart—heaven.

“Hail, Madonna! On the azure of the parchment thou wilt order the servant of thy servants to inscribe in gold a litany to thee? Ah, rather shouldst thou bid me to die.”

She bade it not.



She disappeared as a revelation must disappear, and Roch awoke from his ecstasy over his desk, where the scattered colours and gold leaf awaited his creating touch.

He ceased to hear, to feel, to exist.

Half-blinded, consumed with fever, he spent whole days on the creation of masterpieces no bigger than a hand.

Already from under his fingers in the transparent dusk had sprouted on its frail stem the miraculous *Mystic Rose* with the lips parted in holy ecstasy.

Already the *Tower of Ivory* had outlined on an azure background the simple magnificence of its lines. The *Golden House*, marvelously slender and light, with its narrow elongated crystal windows, with its patterns of palm trees, ferns, golden shrubs, and fabulous flowering plants tracing their delicate outlines on the luminous walls, had already breathed its spell when a white-haired elder, an appointed father, came to make a benevolent inspection of the young monk's new work.

"Create in peace, my son. But let the Lord direct your hand, in order that through your poor brush a stream of grace may flow into that lost soul."

Roch stiffened.

"How so, father?"

"She's a harlot and a daughter of the pride of Satan, this Provençal troubadour, Tyburtia, who at your hands is demanding the prayers due to the Immaculate Virgin. But the Magdalene was also a notorious sinner, and she repented in her heart—and Christ forgave her. What ails you, Roch?" For he had flung himself with outstretched arms on the floor, and was digging his nails into the stone, and from his twisted lips burst laughter and unconscious cries: "Turris Eburnea! Domus Aurea! Rosa mystica! Virgo Virginum! Ha, ha, ha!"

The story is that he fled. Nothing is known exactly.

One day he found himself in a cell hewn out of a block of rock, like the whole monastery. A ghost of himself.

From a square opening in the wall the gaze fell sheer into an abyss, into the eddying depths, into black water foaming over jagged rocks. In front the whole was surrounded by a chain of bare rocks serrated and rising from the bottom of the Baltic, under a perpetually sullen sky.

Rapacious vultures and sea eagles, these and these alone perched on the naked crags where even the sparsest vegetation, like fading hair on the skull of a corpse, was loth to take root.

In the monastery lived monks with faces like birds and animals, maybe philosophers and physicians devoted to mysterious sciences, some tracing strange figures on parchment, circles, triangles and squares, others absorbed in the stars, others drying herbs and preparing mixtures and cordials.

But there was no compassion or blitheness among these monks : the brows of all were withered, and their lips set hard, while their eyes avoided mutual glances.

And at the gates there was no throng of poor folk in search of a kind word and a spoonful of warm victuals, but suspicious persons with the look of tramps would make their appearance—to collect secret orders

Roch, a quiet brother, humble of heart, cut off from his colours and brushes, flung into this hole in the rock, would sit for whole days in the window-niche, on a bench scooped out of the rock, with tightly clenched fists, indistinguishable in the dusk in the greyish white of his habit from the gloomy monotony of the walls, the darkness and the sea.

The soul of him was sick with an unnamed suffering, for the power that lived in him was a good giant, Christofal. He reached out for the sacred books as for the water of life.

He saw the city of the Apocalypse, a city not made of pure gold, transparent as glass, as the vision of the Saint in the desert beheld it, but as the imagination of his simple artist mind created it : a city of lustreless bronze, with a dark patina, antique and shadowy.

He saw the Bridegroom and the Bride on the sun-bright thrones, principalities, powers, kingdoms, virtues, realms, archangels and angels. He saw seraphs with wings of coloured enamel, with long oval faces shining palely like overcast moons, with enormous eyes in which the soul saw itself like a white star in the sea.

But he came to the part about the whore of Babylon, and he turned his eyes away from the pages of the Apocalypse as from the sight of an abyss.

He now took the Old Testament and read : “ Our bed is full of flowers . . . the beams of our house are cedar, and our rafters of cypress.” “ Set me as a seal upon thine heart, as a seal upon thine arm.”

Roch closed the volume and with heart oppressed took refuge in the sweet substance of the Gospels. He opened the book blindly and his glance fell straight on “ Love never faileth, but whether there be prophecies, they shall fail, whether there be tongues they shall cease, whether there be knowledge, it shall vanish away.”

The monk started like one distracted, and slipped out to wander about in the night and his nameless despair, up and down the courts and walls of the monastery.

So one midnight hour he became an invisible witness of the heavenly banquet of the "Manicheans"—the devil's sabbath of the monks—celebrated in company with young witches.

Fettered by dismay, rooted to the ground, he devoured with staring eyes the sinful orgies and—oh! sport of Satan!

In Roch's being, although it shivered with repulsion, in his heart seized with compassion, there was nevertheless something that was intoxicated by the monstrousness and infamy of sin, of this naked passion flaring forth, like those strange heathen fires on the summits of rocks.

From the clouds of sharp and pungent juniper smoke the wind fashioned the outlines of a radiant form.

Before day broke, Roch fled away from this terrible Germanic monastery, on foot, begging his bread, to his native land of Provence. There, like a wounded animal, to plunge into forests untouched by the foot of man, to cling like a snail to the foot of a rock.

If only to get as far as possible away. From the desolation, from the threat, from the darkness of death, from the miasma of crime, from the jackal-like glances of crazed monks and the blasphemous vision of that Madonna of hell.

Of her who, taking on the form of a young minstrel, had appeared under the clay roof of his hut, that sultry night, the night of miracle.

### III.

"Have you never seen me, monk?"

Roch stood stock-still, blind and deaf, like a pillar of stone.

The slender youth got up from the corner of the plank bed.

He shook the wealth of dark curls which ringed round his refined features of golden Florentine bronze.

Brown velvet formed the front of his doublet, sable and golden coronets adorned it, a golden violet shone on it, a chaplet of golden laurels wreathed his brow.

With a glove stitched in gold, heavy with perfume, he lightly touched Roch on the shoulder.

The melancholy monk began to tremble. "What do you want?" he snapped.

"You opened the eyes of a blinded world, you made a leprous world clean, you revived a world that was half dead, showed the road to heaven to a world on its way to hell. The bear held out to you its maimed paw that you might heal it; the she-wolf brought

to you her blinded cub and you took away the blindness from its eyes. I bring you my heart: that you may take it in your hand, like that blind wolf cub, and heal it "

Roch was silent. His breast heaved, shaken by cruel sobs.

"I am she of whom the chroniclers will write, whom legends will celebrate. For the lines of my sonnets, like the crystallization of diamonds—for the thrusts of the rapier on whose glittering point my honour depends. By the whiteness of my knees! Only once did this brow bend, in order to receive the gold crown of the bard! I am the minstrel Tyburtia. And now, look you, monk!"

The minstrel Tyburtia bent her knee and knelt down, so that her face became subtly beautiful, and her eyes, starry and clouded, shone close to Roch's face.

"I met you, man of God, and your soul showed dimly before me, like size without form. My golden glory seemed to me like useless metal, and my pleasure bitter as myrrh. I have followed, therefore, in your steps and I have sought you—close on your heels . . . My life . . . and thought which rises above life . . . and love greater than my thought . . ."

Roch was silent, his heart dead within him. A fiery rain glittered before his eyes, a flaming whirlpool danced in his breast, in his loins he felt as it were the brand of red-hot iron.

"You are silent, sir? But I shall wither at your feet like grass, and my glory like the flower of the grass. Purge me with hyssop and I shall be clean."

He managed to stammer out: "Go in peace and sin no more."

For a little time the woman shook her head dreamily. "Where shall I go?" she said, rising. "Shall I return to the world? Where Satan goes about like a roaring lion, seeking whom he may devour."

She looked at Roch. Drops of mortal sweat glistened on his brow.

She drew herself up quickly. "I shall stay with you," she said resolutely.

Roch trembled and leaned against the wall for support.

"What do you say?" he whispered tonelessly. But he was broken, and there was not even one thought in his brain.

She looked down at her light dress, and suddenly let her head fall on her breast as if in shame.

"Monk, give me one of your habits."

"I have only one."

She gazed round the hovel. From a corner she brought out a wolfskin and handed it to Roch.

"You will take this."

Without resisting he took the skin from her hand and went out of the hut

He wandered about in the half-clear night, hounded by something invisible. He forced his way through junipers and undergrowth, through wormwood and bracken.

An owl hooted among the trees, the leaves rustled, under the roots of the oak-trees nests of serpents hissed.

Roch, the man of God, wore on his shoulders a wolf-pelt, the claws of which he had crossed on his chest and about his hips; but his naked trunk, thighs and shoulders, his long hair and tangled beard, made him like a creature of the forest, a shaggy man of the Stone Age.

His eyes blinked fearfully and wildly like those of a night-bird under the light of the stars sown in the heavens, at first white like the lost teeth of dead animals, then yellow and glistening like drops of resin.

In his hand he held his coarse, dark yellow habit and the hempen girdle he used to fasten it.

"Roch."

He stopped as if rooted where he stood

The young minstrel was sitting on the stone coping round a spring. She greeted the approaching monk with a starry glance Rapture glowed in her voice.

"John the Baptist! Your eyes like two lions, your lips painted with dark purple . . . John!"

Suddenly she threw her head back in a gesture of triumph. "So I desired you!" she cried. "I am Nature, the mistress of the elements—the beginning and the foundation. I am ecstasy and the power of the senses. I am happy love, I am sinless life. But you are the soul, the tortured soul of the world. Because you have renounced me and violated my laws, I am come to hear your confession. On your knees, monk!"

Roch cried out like a man plunging into an abyss, and fell with arms outstretched.

Round his neck he felt a passionate embrace, on his lips a burning coal.

He closed his arms, in order to feel her on his heaving breast, but he embraced—emptiness.

She had leapt lightly on to the coping of the well.

A cool smile curved her young lips, a light wind fanned her dark hair like the feathers of the royal bird.

"Do not trust me! For the third time I change my mask, and perhaps raise it a little. I am something greater than truth and life, I am the great lie of life, art! Love is nothing to me. But my kingdom lies open before you. Laurels await you there—and I! Return to it!"

But Roch crashed down as into a tomb, striking his forehead on the dewy grass.

## IV

On the pale purple heaven were streaks of unawakened colours, like women sleeping in silver couches.

Suddenly alarmed, they blushed with shame and disappeared, eclipsed by golden raindrops

Sun-shot showers poured themselves on the earth, streams of molten gold ran through the heart of the forest, penetrated deep into the cool breasts of the waters.

Along the bank of the crystal streams, along the tattered velvet of dark moss, flecked with snowy foam, the fallow deer flew by, and a girl returned in the garb of a minstrel, with a mandoline in her hand.

Returned to her rainbows, to her flowers, to unborn seas and skies.

And at this same time a harassed, bowed man was struggling by a steep rocky path up to a cleft in the rock. He wore a coarse, dark yellow cloak, with a wooden rosary at his belt, and carried a scourge in his hand.

He had a gaunt, blackened face that looked as if it had been hewn from darkness, and a strange mouth, irregular and passionate.

He fell on his knees on the sharp stone, having stripped off his cloak from the shoulders to the waist.

The crack of a whip resounded, the echo of regular strokes lashing with stubborn strength naked shoulders, chest and arms.

"From the depth of my fall, a miserable sinner, I cry to Thee. I, a poor worm, I, the dust of the earth, I repent, O Lord, I repent, repent."

He gulped, the hand with which he was flogging himself slackened, and his head fell low on his breast.

His eyes ran with blood, his lips whispered unconsciously, "O Morning Star! O Mystic Rose!"

Suddenly he hurled his whole body forward and cried: "I love you!"

The penitent fell with outstretched arms on the rock, which wounded him as he fell. Bloody strips of flesh hung down from his flayed shoulders.

## THE ARÁKUSH

*Translated from the Russian of S. N. SERGEYEV-TSENSKY by*  
W. A. MORISON

At the age of nine I was suddenly filled with a great passion for doves and song-birds, and that is how I came to know Avdeyich the bird-snarer and pigeon-fancier.

I remember him in the greatest detail—a little old man with cheeks as pink as Easter eggs, a little white beard hanging straight down from his chin, and greenish eyes that missed nothing—eyes such as you often see in red Pekin ducks. He was quite spry in his movements, but sparing of words; and even when he was joking he kept quite calm, with never the shadow of a smile.

Sometimes people would call to him from the street—“Avdeyich! Hey there, Avdeyich!”

Two words would proceed from the window looking on the street:

“Coming, coming!”

They would wait a while, and again:

“Avdeyich! What are you up to there?”

“Be with you in a moment!”

Another pause, and the grumble.

“How much longer are we supposed to wait?—Avdeyich!”

“Almost with you now!”

And through the bird-cages which hung in great profusion from floor to ceiling Avdeyich would at length make his way to the window.

“Well, what is it?”

“I suppose *you* didn’t by any chance sneak that pigeon of ours?”

Avdeyich lived “out Gunners’ way,” that is to say in the so-called Gunners’ Suburb, the most primitive part of our town, in which there dwelt many passionate pigeon-fanciers.

“A pigeon, you say?”

“Why, yes, a pigeon—what do you suppose?”

“What sort of a pigeon?”

“Why, just an ordinary one—same as any other. A red tumbler.”

“Yesterday you missed it?”

“Yesterday—when do you suppose?”

With his Pekin-duck eyes Avdeyich would closely scan the man standing at his window, Hryapin the shoemaker perhaps, a noted

drunkard, or Nosenkov the locksmith, a long fellow with a grubby nose and a remarkably filthy apron, or whoever might be in quest of the red tumbler, and would calmly pronounce the words :

“ One rouble.”

This was the old man's invariable charge; no one was unacquainted with it, or ever came to him without a rouble in his pocket.

It was curious to note how the Gunners and the Sharpshooters (inhabitants of another suburb of ours), folk normally riotous and drunken, lovers of fisticuffs and all manner of disturbance, kept to certain unwritten laws of their own in the matter of pigeons.

On summer evenings, with pieces of rag tied to the end of poles, all they did was to let out pigeons and drive them about, whistling martially on their roof-tops.

The flights of pigeons shot up till they were almost out of sight above the Sharpshooters and Gunners (descendants of genuine sharpshooters and gunners of the times of Tsar Alexis), and there, in the heights, they soared, and swooped, and dived, and turned somersaults, and dropped down with furled wings like vultures; and among them there were, known to all, kings of high-flying, and kings of soaring, and kings of swooping down.

I remember that a special cause of rapture and esteem on our part were the so-called screw-pigeons, birds that flew up to a tremendous height and then swooped down again with a screwlike motion, in a spiral, turning smoothly head over heels and provoking cries of delight and astonishment from all those dear people with poles.

But those evenings devoted to pigeons were not merely the occasion for emotion and rapture, challenge and passion; they also witnessed a sort of hunt, almost a war.

The pigeon hosts wheeled about up there in the sky, and their commanders stood down below on the roof-tops; and the aim of all the complicated manœuvring, the ear-splitting whistling on two fingers, the waving of bits of rag, was that, as darkness fell, one's roof-top should be the settling-place not merely for one's own flight, but also for at least one stranger-pigeon lured from some other owner.

Such martial booty was considered quite legitimate, and to take it back by force was not done; in such cases the *bon ton* of the pigeon-fanciers even scorned recourse to abuse. One thing only was recognised: if ransom was offered for the pigeon, it could not be retained any longer.



From whom could I, a lad of nine, buy pigeons? From none other than these same Gunners and Sharpshooters. And when I too endeavoured with martial mien to wave a pole on my roof-top, my pigeons regularly flew back to their old cotes.

With pigeons I had no luck, and hence I was filled with all the more passion for tomtits, goldfinches, quail, which no one could lure from my possession.

Many years have passed since then. It must be a quarter of a century ago that I last beheld birch-trees, aspens, firs . . . Now they appear before my inner eye wrapped in a sort of confused mist, such as one finds in the paintings of Claude Monet.

In those days I used to go with Avdeyich among those birches, aspens, firs, with traps and snares to catch glushkas, Siberian tomtits, lozinovkas.

Though the passage of time has of course effaced all the bright hues from the memory of those experiences, something indistinctly but joyously resounding still lingers in my mind. . . . Vain to attempt to put it into words; it simply can't be done!

On dry and still warm autumn mornings, when the air was denser, and the earth firmer, and the wormwood more visible on the balks, when the black-polled monastic Siberian tomtits and the glushkas with dove-coloured cheeks but also in black cowls, and the long-tailed blue titmice, white and azure, downy, decked out triumphantly as though for ball or wedding, came nearer to the forest-fringe, how ineffably joyous it was to wake of a Sunday at daybreak, when the cracks in the shutters were only just beginning to show, to drag on one's clothes, snatch up the gear prepared overnight, and slip out of the house, careful to rouse no one; then hurry along the yet drowsy lane to where Avdeyich lived, knock on his little window overlooking the yard, and hear the clipped word:

"Ready!"

And in an hour at most we would be together in the woods.

The souls of children are like artists' souls; they are bewitched. But when, in the woods of autumn, amid the yellowing tints, with the smell of ripened leaves in my nostrils, bathed in the pellucid sorrow of the departing year, I could not refrain from crying out to wake the echoes, Avdeyich would turn on me the severe eyes of a Pekin drake:

"Now then, now then! D'you think you're in school?"

And I would subside.

Avdeyich never winked his eyelids. . . . It was quite impossible to make him laugh or to rouse his ire, to surprise or frighten him; his was a sort of nimble-footed, monosyllabic petrification.

Vodka he never touched.

Since my father had nothing against my passion for birds and for Avdeyich, I think he must have known the old man, though I never saw him at our house.

Considered in one light, Avdeyich was a Gunner like any other, but at the same time he was too much a creature of the woods to be anybody's man. I, a lad of nine, was in some respects a son of the family like any other, but at the same time too much in love with the sky, the fields, the woods, to be anybody's boy. This brought us close, the lad and the old man.

I did all I could to help him with his fowling. While we were making for the woods, I would tell him about the fabulous monsters of yore, of travels through the deserts; everything I had learnt from my childish reading.

He listened, but scarcely believed me.

I remember how he once asked:

"And what was the name of the beast that disobeyed Noah and wouldn't go into the Ark?"

Never had I heard of such a beast.

"You see—you don't know. . . . The beast had great horns, and could swim far. . . . Yet as time went on he too lost strength. . . . Why? Because birds settled on his horns. . . . He would shake them off, but back they would fly. . . . That's how it was. . . . At that time countless birds were flying about. . . . And so he was forced to drown shamefully, for his great pride."

In later years I met many hunters from the common people, and, strange to relate, they too were not very interested by tales from the long-written history of man on earth. But mention the Flood, and at once their eyes would flash, just as though it had happened the day before. And apart from Avdeyich I encountered great experts in that event, but Avdeyich was the first in time.

He sported a very worn peaked cap with a red band. I imagined he had formerly been in some sort of Government service, and wore his cap like many another retired official. But once at market I saw him in the bird-row wearing a fresher-looking cap with a blue band, like a fireman's. From this I deduced that Avdeyich just liked uniform-caps, and that perhaps in some trunk of his, wrapped in newspaper to protect it from the moths, he kept for

specially festive occasions a cap with a green band, hardly worn at all

I remember asking him about adders, whether we might encounter one in the woods. He answered disdainfully

"If we do, it's ours . . . Just seize it by the withers and spit in its gaping jaws, and 'twill be as mild as you could wish. An adder goes in mortal fear of human spittle."

If not as regards adders, at least with respect to birds Avdeyich was no mean expert.

It was he that taught me to look at the tail of a captured goldfinch and count the feathers. If there were fourteen, it was a birch-finch, a valuable bird, fetching fifty copecks at the very least. But if there were only twelve feathers, it was a burdock-finch, its price on a market-day five copecks, and scarcely worth bothering about

In skins too he perceived his own signs and tokens (but I have forgotten them now), and even in titmice. Of titmice he valued only those with large heads, in whom a black stripe ran from the neck right across the yellow breast, uninterrupted, broad and bright. And when from the thawed patches in the spring snow he brought home dozens of larks, with crests and without, he very carefully scrutinised each one separately; ruffled their feathers, spread their wings, measured on his thumb-nail their crests and spurs, and placed them in family cages, steppe-larks with steppe-larks, wood-larks with wood-larks, field-larks along with field-larks.

In his hands larks grew tame remarkably soon, and learnt to imitate the voices of other birds.

Often when I was in his dwelling and birds were piping away in thirty or forty cages, he would suddenly attract my attention

"How's that for singing!"

"A chaffinch, is it?"

"That's the third time I've heard him called a chaffinch. . . . Why, he's a wood-lark!"

How many rare songsters he had! One may simply put it this way, that he had none that were not rare; never kept them. The goldfinches with twelve feathers in their tails he set free before he reached home. (But never where he had caught them; they would tell the others, and spoil the hunt. This he believed with unshakable faith.)

The cautiousness of birds, or perhaps their ways in general, had imbued him with a conviction of their intelligence; and even

the dull-witted linnets, which in the winter blundered in droves into his snares, were not by him accused of stupidity.

"Just you try hopping about in the cold! Everyone knows what drives them into the noose, it's bitter need"

And when folk called on Avdeyich to purchase birds, their merits were almost more than he could enumerate.

In our town, in the years I am recalling, there was a sort of epidemic of love for the twittering of birds, and it was not even necessary for Avdeyich to stand in the market-place, he was known to all and sundry, and folk called at his dwelling. It was only on Lady day that he took to market large cages full of five-copeck burdock-finches

At that season birds were purchased by soft-bodied, soft-hearted women in warm kerchiefs, who set them free as soon as they felt the little hearts going pit-a-pat; lovingly, with tears in their eyes, watched them fly away, and crossed themselves fervently in their wake.

Avdeyich shunned the superfluous when he went abroad. On him, as on a good soldier, everything had its right place and was to hand when required.

On his back a bag with a bird-box and a cage. In his belt, at the side, two little bags, one with black bread for his own needs, the other with bait for the birds and divided into compartments: hempseed, ants' eggs, even living beetles. On a strap over his shoulder, so that they hung on his left side, two sorts of snares. A stick he took just in case

It was precisely in the neighbourhood of the Sharpshooters' and Gunners' Suburbs that the woods came up close to our town. In those parts there still remained, overgrown with grass, the ramparts and ditches of the old fort; and not far beyond them lay the woods—young woods belonging to the town, not to the State. As for the State forest of building-timber, with wood-grouse, bears and wolf-packs, it began some five versts away

If only you could have seen and heard Avdeyich luring birds! At such times the little old man in the uniform-cap grew even more serious than usual. And it was revealed, there in the woods, that he could with reedy call lead into error far-sounding waxwings, zoryankas, linnets. . . He could peep like a titmouse, and warble like a nightingale; and without the help of a quail-pipe he knew how to strike his tongue on the roof of his mouth and make a sound just like the call of a quail. . . .

I asked him once :

Avdeyich gave a look full of meaning, and even lowered his voice :

" He keeps hidden. . . He's a very secretive bird . . . Only lives in dense thickets, where you can't creep up to him. . . And he hates men. . . "

" And what can you tell him by ? What does he look like, the arákush ? "

The old man's eyes flashed .

" He's a perfect beauty ! Why, compared with him a nightingale is nothing . . . A grey bird . . . All his breast, like a fine general's, covered with ribbons a red ribbon, a blue ribbon, a moiré ribbon . . . A yellow-browed bird . . . And his tail—sort of brownish . . . "

He shook his head and added, as he had begun

" A perfect beauty ! "

Never before had I seen Avdeyich so animated

" Decked out with colours . . . Much better than a nightingale . . . But hardly any bigger . . . And he twitches his tail just like a nightingale . . . And sings just like one . . . "

There was no one at home I could ask

My mother knew as much about forest-birds as mothers do, and my father was a morose man and too much the town-dweller.

So I didn't bother to ask . . . I just kept firmly in mind The arákush . . . twenty-four trills . . . a coloured breast . . .

Strangely enough, when I heard of this remarkable bird I lost all taste for my lozinovkas, penduline titmice, ox-eyes, glushkas and Siberian tomtits.

Their chattering din even began to irritate me.

I began to eye them with the scorn of a nine-year-old lad pierced by a vision.

It is true that in the morning I gave them food . hempseed for one, ants' eggs for another ; poured water into their drinking-troughs. But their enchantment had vanished, all serious interest in them had left me.

" Prattlers ! " I would say, shaking my head with scornful compassion, when they leapt about in their little cages, twittered, scraped their beaks against the bars.

The arákush filled all my thoughts.

I can even remember how the tears welled when I upbraided Avdeyich :

" Why didn't you tell me before ? "

I had no mates of my own age, or else their company bored me. Probably the latter

As we lived right on the edge of the town, I had grown used to wandering alone about the autumnal kitchen-gardens; through the great pits that marked the site of a long-abandoned brick-factory (in these pits grew remarkable forget-me-nots, and lilac anemones which Avdeyich called "sleep-grass"); over the marshes in the bottom, where, besides frogs, horse-leeches and water-beetles, there abounded all manner of highly interesting creatures

And there, one day in July, I came upon a great patch of weeds.

A year before there had been a melon-plot in this place. But now on the loosened black soil (and the summer was rainy, too) there had sprung up so thick a patch of cotton-thistles—dull-green, shaggy, dotted with the pink bonnets of the flowers, impenetrably prickly, more than seven feet high—that it seemed to me like a great forest, full of secrets, of possibilities such as are only dreamed of

And it was in this clump of thistles, on its very edge, that I saw the arákush

There was no room for doubt. It was as though something had pierced my heart. 'Tis he!

Slowly, noiselessly, I made my way round the prickly wall of thistles. And suddenly I heard an agitated, nightingale-like *chock-krrr . . . chock-krrr . . .* I raised my eyes. Bright green, bright red, dazzling, awe-inspiring, yearned-for—the vision of a moment, and then the brown-grey body darted away and vanished in the thicket.

I even crouched down and closed my eyes.

Had I really seen it? Was it all imagination?

But a minute later, from somewhere in the depths, came *chock-krrr . . . chock-krrr . . .*

However much I searched, however much, scratching my hands, I peered into the depths of his kingdom, he did not that day reveal so much as another glimpse of himself.

And on the morrow, scarcely awaiting the dawn, I set out from home, equipped just like Avdeyich with a bird-box in a bag, ants' eggs as bait, a snare, and an iron spade to clear a space in the bushes.

There, in the kingdom of the arákush, I proceeded very carefully.

I made a narrow and tortuous way leading in to the centre, so that I could only just crawl along it and no one who chanced to pass might disturb me. There I cleared a space in which the snare

might snap to, missing by an inch or so the overhanging pink heads of the thistles; and from twisted twigs and very thick, tough stems (I could hardly cut them with my penknife) I made myself a bower to hide in.

In this bower, huddled up, trying not to stir, I waited.

What a slumbering forest was that clump of weeds! How many unusual things there were in it!

But the only thing that interested me was my arákush . . . Several times I had managed to get a glimpse of him—a glimpse, no more, for he flashed past like lightning. Two or three times he perched on a thistle-shoot above the cleared space; but incredibly cautious, flicking up his little tail, he would plunge again into the thicket.

I waited patiently for several hours, my eyes at a chink in the wall of the bower, my right hand on the string leading to the snare.

It was very hot; the thistles gave forth a stupefying odour, bees hummed ceaselessly. The ox-eyes (little grey birds) beat all round in syncopation, as though with tiny hammers, and now and then would settle down on the cleared space to peck at the ants' eggs. I frightened them away with a slight pull at the string, and kept rebuking myself for having sprinkled only two handfuls of eggs; had there been more, an ox-eye might perhaps have enticed the arákush down . . . The numble, restless, dock-tailed nutcracker-birds also hopped about on the cleared space, and they too had to be driven away. They would eat up all the eggs, and then there would be nothing to lure the arákush.

He, meanwhile, seemed to me to be quite near. Unseen by me, I felt, he sat watching the cleared space and the snare with his yellow-browed eyes, large as a nightingale's and proud . . . Let him think that all this novelty in his kingdom was merely of use to him, and not dangerous, that he could snap up a dainty morsel and fly away like the ox-eye, gobble it up and be off like the nutcracker-bird . . .

My whole body had grown numb, and circles were appearing before my eyes from the strain of watching, when he, my arákush, at last perched on the cleared space. Cautious, he at once fluttered up again a little way, but almost immediately settled down once more and began to peck greedily at the eggs.

And I pulled the snare down over him . . .

Even now I can distinctly remember how filled with joy I was, with a joy that at first could hardly be believed in, a joy that made

me breathless, but I cannot describe it—it simply will not go into words.

I remember how I rushed over to the snare under which the dumbfounded beauty had cowered. I was of course looking at the snare, and not at the ground under my feet; tripped over something, fell down flat, giving my knee a nasty bump, but immediately sprang up again and, reaching the snare, covered the bird with my cap as he fluttered in the net, and beneath the cap put my hand out towards him.

His little heart was hammering just like my own . .

It took me a couple of minutes to recover myself, to master my joy . . .

The bird had next to be placed in the box, but this was still in my bower, and I was afraid I should not be able to carry him that far, that my trembling hands would release him.

Finally I said aloud :

“ I will bring the box over here . . take him out of the snare and pop him in.”

I remember that I set out for the bird-box sideways, awkwardly, squinting round all the time at the snare and my cap. When I had the box, I sprang back to the snare again.

But when I was taking the arákush out from beneath the net and putting it in the bird-box I acted with magnificent restraint, no worse than Avdeyich; and closing the lid of the box, I did not forget to fasten it with stout twine so that the arákush should not manage to open the little door when he began to struggle

And in fact he at once began to struggle for all he was worth.

How proud he was, that little king of songsters !

Titmice which have only just been caught struggle desperately, they dash from side to side, cry out, hiss, attempt to break the wooden bars with their beaks, dig at the sides of the box with all their strength, and sometimes beat their little heads till the blood flows; but all this in a sort of feminine way. They seem to be filled with an indignation that is more theatrical than genuine, and rapidly become accustomed to their new surroundings. Larks and wood-larks put up a good struggle, they spread their wings, trying all the time to fly upwards, and keep beating against the roof of the box. For this reason bird-catchers have for them special boxes with canvas tops. Nightingales struggle with the regular movement of a pendulum: jump-bang, jump-bang; to the left—one-two, to the right—one-two . . . For nightingales the box is draped all round with something black.



Different birds struggle in different ways.

But I had never seen any bird struggle so terribly, with such cruelty to itself, as did the arákush.

He struggled for the rest of the day and all the night, overturning the little jar with water, scattering the ants' eggs in the feeding-trough.

My father wanted to set him free, so in the morning I took the box containing my captive to Avdeyich.

I found the old man at home; he was cleaning out cages.

I had the box with the arákush wrapped up in my old shirt, and I put it down silently just by the door.

"Avdeyich," I said in an excited but by no means agitated tone, "would you like to catch an arákush?"

"Anyone would," retorted Avdeyich.

"Yes, but tell me properly—would *you* like to?"

"Anyone would," repeated Avdeyich, sprinkling seed for the siskins.

"Very well, then . . . Anyone would like to, but I have already done it!" I burst out, too impatient for lengthy explanations.

Avdeyich looked at me attentively.

Had I not hoped to amaze him? But even now he showed no surprise, and merely said

"Nonsense!"

Then I snatched up my bird-box and unwrapped it from the shirt.

"Here he is—look!"

The arákush struggled furiously.

I noticed that he had already dashed the feathers from his poll, and that his head was bloody, but gave this no more than a glance. I fastened my gaze on the old man's white eyeballs: Was he glad? Was he surprised?

And Avdeyich said disdainfully.

"An arákush, eh? . . . What sort of an arákush do you call that?"

"It's not an arákush? . . . What is it, then?" I cried, growing heated.

"Why, it hasn't even got a proper name!"

"But what is it? Come on, tell me!"

"It's called . . . the mottled nut-hatch."

"Nut-hatch? . . . Go on! . . . What are nut-hatches? . . . I don't know a thing about them!"

In point of fact I was, thanks to Avdeyich, quite familiar with those autumn birds with red breasts and little tails always a-quiver.

"I can see you don't! D'you think it's an ordinary nut-hatch? I tell you it's a *mottled* nut-hatch!"

"How do you mean, a nut-hatch? A blue ribbon, a red ribbon—now look!" I cried, almost in tears. "Just as you told me!"

"D'you think they're like that in an arákush? Why, in an arákush they're quite different. I can picture you catching an arákush!—Now, this is a mottled nut-hatch. . . A worthless bird. . . 'Twill neither sing nor live long, just pine away. . . If you like you can leave it here, to save dragging it home again—I'll set it free."

What a sorrow that seemed to me, then! Not an arákush, anything but an arákush, king of songsters, merely some sort of mottled nut-hatch. . .

After that I did not even stay long with Avdeyich. I just told him where I had caught the bird, in what clump of weeds; wrapped the box neatly up again in my shirt, and carried it home.

I had no appetite for dinner. I sat stubbornly listening to the struggles of my little bird; were they perhaps decreasing in violence?

I still had a faint hope that he would get used to the box.

But in this Avdeyich turned out to be right. Next morning my arákush lay in a corner of its box, dead.

I took him gently out, admiring for the last time his general's breast, gently ruffled his little feathers, tender as mimosa-down, and buried him under a lime-tree in the garden.

For two days after that I did not visit Avdeyich, or even leave the house. But on the third day I felt an urge to explore once again the mysterious thistle-forest. Perhaps I might, if only from afar, hear an arákush singing, behold another beauty, alive and proud, his breast aglow with colours.

This time I went without snare and bird-box—and what did I find? Creeping cautiously into the cleared space, I perceived the old man's familiar snare; and Avdeyich himself sat crouched in my bower, waving his hand at me. He was snaring "*mottled nut-hatches*" . . .

There are no "*mottled nut-hatches*," and there are no twenty-four trills in the repertoire of that modest little bird the *varákushka* (blue-throated warbler).

But perhaps old Avdeyich was not deceiving me after all.

A great many years have passed since then, and I now think that he really believed what he told me.

At the time I went away disillusioned in the old man. I did not, at the time, understand why he had to deceive me as calmly as he had previously told me the truth.

And only now, when a whole eternity has passed, do I see that he was protecting even from me, a boy of nine, his secret dream.

Even Avdeyich must have a dream. Without a dream life is unbearable . . . It is dull, sad, oppressive

The nightingale, "that sings with words," uttering its twelve phrases distinctly, from a full throat, in some sort of order of its own, and filled with a huge affection for them—the nightingale has fascinated men for thousands of years . . . It is the universally recognised friend of lovers and poets . . . What poet has not sung of the nightingale? No such poet ever existed .

But Avdeyich, little old grey-haired Avdeyich, lover of uniform-caps with coloured bands, had murmured against this . . . He had risen in revolt ! . . . He had said to himself I too am a poet, I too am in love . . . And I do not wish that the notes of the nightingale should mark the bounds of song ! . . . I believe and confess, that in deep places unapproachable to man, its breast decked with ribbons of blue and red, there hides, *secretes* itself, the genuine crown and glory of feathered creatures, just twice as good a songster as the best of nightingales; and its name is *arákush* . . . This is all I live for, all my pride lies in knowing this . . . This dream alone calls me and lures me, that in my narrow room, caught and tamed by me, there should burst into song no mere nightingale, or "mottled nut-hatch," or blue-throated warbler, but a genuine *arákush* . . . D'you hear him singing? . . . D'you hear that?—the thirteenth trill ! . . . More and more . . . All the records of the nightingale are broken . . . The fifteenth trill . . . The twentieth . . . Just count for yourselves ! . . . Twenty-two . . . *Twenty-three* . . . TWENTY-FOUR !

Out into the yard have been carried all the other cages with those pitiful larks, thrushes, canaries, nightingales . . . Sing loud, *arákush* ! . . . Listen, crowding underneath the window, Gunners and Sharpshooters ! . . . With bated breath, blocking the roadway, holding up the traffic—that nothing may hinder your listening ! . . .

Now do you hear? . . . That's how an *arákush* sings ! . . . And who found him, the real one? Who caught him?—Avdeyich ! . . . For fifty years he searched, and at last he found him . . . That's the sort of man Avdeyich is ! . . .

Days of yore . . . Ah, me ! . . .

You, of course, are still alive, Avdeyich : you are deathless . . .  
Even now, of course, you are seeking your " arákush," as I am mine  
. . . We should find life not worth living, you and I, without our  
" arákush " . . . Dull beyond words . . . Unbearable we should  
find it—better the grave at once . . .

Av-de-yich ' . . . Ah, me !

Your hand, comrade !

*July, 1926.*

# EDWARD BENES

## I

A GREAT Czech patriot and a great European democrat, Edward Beneš has had to go the way of exile. His fate is by no means personal. It was just his attempt to weld patriotism and Europeanism that contributed to his perdition. Together with Masaryk he made his country, Czechoslovakia, an independent European State. It lies now in ruins—a victim of European reaction. All his life through he worshipped Democracy, and he helped to promote peace by co-operation of free and liberated nations. In a difficult moment he is forsaken by Democracy for an uncertain peace by a rotten compromise with dictation. Dr. Beneš's tragedy is that of Democracy. He fell a victim and symbol of its defeat.

The resignation of Dr. Beneš has served as a signal for a humiliating spectacle which we are witnessing in his country. His adversaries try to draw upon him the popular wrath for Czechoslovakia's Calvary. He is made responsible for his allegiance to his democratic alliances; his name—and that of Masaryk—are execrated and dragged in the mud. I do not believe that the popular masses could so soon change their mind. But such sudden "changes of policy" will always find their obedient servitors. . . . We already hear about a trial to be instituted against Dr. Beneš, and we read the proposed points of accusation. Should Herr Hitler have realised his scheme of armed invasion, Dr. Beneš might now, like the Chancellor, Schuschnigg, be sitting in prison. Certain other parallels might be drawn between the two sufferers of the immediate "change of policy" made necessary because of the lack of resistance on the part of defaulting democracies.

Dr. Beneš needs no defence. His, and Masaryk's, policy, which gave freedom to the nation and made the country independent, is clear and open to everybody. Every step of it is made known to posterity by copious writings of both of them. Dr. Beneš, periodically, presented his reports to the Parliament. He explained his philosophical and moral reasons for carrying on just *this* policy, and no other, in numerous articles and conferences. Before becoming a statesman and a diplomatist he was a journalist and a scholar. A systematic collection of his utterances was recently published under the significant title "Thought and Action"—"Gedanke und That." Thought and action have always been one for him, and his policy is a living organism—like that of his famous predecessor. I do not know whether there remain many secrets to reveal in

Dr. Beneš's diplomatic activity. The contemporary Press generally know more of them than the very diplomatists concerned. But this is a matter for an historian.

In this brief sketch I can only say what everybody knows, but what must not be left to oblivion at the moment when Dr. Beneš is obliged to leave his lifelong and untiring work unfinished. I count myself among his personal friends. I shared most of his views and thought I knew his intentions. I deeply pity his country for being left without his further guidance at the decisive moment of her destiny. I believe, though, that she cannot be left dead by her malefactors. Her past vouches so much for her future . . .

## II

I have to begin by underlining again the chief feature which characterises Dr. Beneš's historical personality: the complete union of ardent patriotism and equally sincere universalism in his feeling and thinking. How did it happen that the national idea, without turning into militant nationalistic chauvinism, was welded in his mind with international idealism, without its taking the shape of an abstract doctrine? The answer will also explain why the policy he chose was for him the only one possible.

The task is made easy because Dr. Beneš has himself told us this part of his story in his Memoirs. A poor student—already noticed by Professor Masaryk—he came to Paris, to live on 60 crowns a month and to work hard, studying contemporary literature and politics. He was then a follower of Marx, a consistent materialist, a violent anti-clerical and almost an atheist. He made acquaintances among the emigrant youth, including Russian emigrants of the first revolution of 1905, whose ideals he welcomed; he also perfected there his knowledge of Russian. He then dug deeper into philosophical doctrines: Bergson's intuitivism, James's pragmatism, Durkheim's sociology. Kant was hard for him to swallow, but he made of him a strong basis for his later criticisms. A glimpse into England's religious habits of life somehow mitigated his unswerving positivism—in expectation of when Masaryk would initiate him into the religious tradition of his own country. He then passed quite a year in Germany, which impressed him by the solidity of her science and the deepness of her philosophy. On his coming back to Prague (1908) he already felt himself a European, a complete democrat and a strong radical. At the same time he felt himself a Slav, and he cherished the dream of a glorious future for a free Russia. From the French Revolution

through the Russian to Czechoslovakia's great preachers of liberty the transition was not yet quite clear; he had to learn it from Masaryk, whose professional career he now wished to imitate and follow.

The World War put an end to these aspirations. Wider issues were opening instead. Personal strivings for the advent of Democracy were to be applied in order to attain the double aim of uniting the liberation of his native country with the triumph of European democracy over the Germano-Austro-Hungarian invaders.

To find connecting links between these elements of the problem was much easier for the oppressed nations of Austro-Hungary than to make them understood even by prominent politicians of the Western democracies. Lloyd George, who is famous among the Russians for his "General Kharkov," would ask his neighbour at a sitting of the World Conference just where the Czechs were living, and in the heat of the contest between Czechoslovakia and Poland he would not know where Teschen was located. He is not the only one to ignore such petty details of the European map and ethnology. The very origin of the war—the Russian defence of Serbia from Austrian aggression—was somehow relegated to the second place and obscured by subsequent events which made the war universal. The invasion of Belgium, the conflicting claims of Germany and Great Britain were generally known, but only very few scholars knew the situation in Central and South-eastern Europe. It was in the first place to them, to professors like Ernest Denis, Seton-Watson, etc., that Masaryk and Beneš had to address themselves in order through them to mobilise European public opinion. Both had to emigrate for that very aim, while other "rebels" founded a secret group, a "Mafia," in Prague. In all haste Dr. Beneš and Prof. Masaryk had to make the leading ideas of their programme of struggle known through the Press, by lectures at the Sorbonne and at King's College in London, or in interviews with a few leading statesmen, such as Briand or Robert Cecil, with whom they could find a hearing as early as 1915-1916. It so happened that their views and their information helped to extend, to elucidate and to convey the idealistic meaning of the ultimate aims of the war which, until then, had been far from clearly defined. It was also then that people learnt to know exactly what were the opposite strivings on the side of their enemies and why the war was worth fighting to the end, for the definite purpose of building up a "New Europe." "If we do not include Mr. Wilson's later utterances," rightly says Dr. Beneš, "it was only among us

that the total, the synthetic view of the World War was concentrated, as far as its importance, its meaning was concerned, that is why our views had such an influence on all those who studied them more closely, and our action possessed such a strong intellectual power, people felt that it had a solid base of doctrine and a programme conscientiously built on it and well adapted to the aim in view "

However, there was a part of the programme, and that the most important for the Czech leaders, which was not so easy to impart to European politicians—to the length of making it a constituent part of the practical policy of the Allies. It was just the independence of Czechoslovakia. There was a time when the Czechs themselves did not think of it, while limiting their wishes to the restoration of their "historical rights" within the Habsburg Monarchy. This moment had soon passed when Masaryk and Beneš began their propaganda abroad. They succeeded in building up their "Foreign Czechoslovak Committee" which, on 17 November, 1915, published a "Manifesto" declaring the independence of Czechoslovakia and a state of war with Austria-Hungary. A super-human task fell on Dr. Beneš to associate with this firm decision the public opinion, the activity of the Allied diplomacy, and even the patriotic action of his own compatriots at home who remained under the sway of the enemy. It was then that he published his passionate appeal: "Détruisez l'Autriche."

### III

What was at that moment the alternative price of a Germano-Austro-Hungarian victory? Let us not talk of the heaps of nationalistic war pamphlets and songs, of sweeping maps covering with the German colour the greater part of Europe, of declarations of German scholars and intellectuals. Let us take a book cleverly written and presented in a scholarly way: Friedrich Naumann's *Central Europe* (Mittel-Europa). The English editor of this book tells us that Naumann "had his readers in the workman's cottage and the undergraduate's sitting-room, in the boudoir of the millionaire's wife and in the offices of high officials." The book does not smell much of "Pangermanism." As a first step to a further expansion the author, who is a former Socialist and radical, is satisfied to preach a kind of federal union with the Dual Monarchy without even pretending to trespass on its sovereign rights. It will be a modern variation of the old-time "Holy Roman Empire of the German Nation" which has passed since through the stage of Bismarck's



"Lesser Germany." I do not presume to analyse this book. Its leading idea of constructing an "economic" group of "Central Europe" is plausible; the author's direct claims are moderate, his knowledge of the subject and of its literature is exhaustive. He does not conceal the difficulties and contradictions of the task to be undertaken. But so much the more dangerous was the impression largely produced by the idea of creating a "Central Europe," and especially so as long as the issue of the war remained uncertain. The danger became much greater when Austria-Hungary showed a certain desire to detach her cause from that of her Northern ally.

It was on 12 December, 1916, that Austria-Hungary first made a peace proposal which was declined by the Allies. However, Woodrow Wilson's note of 20 December, which asked both belligerent parties to formulate their war aims, treated them as equals. Three days before, Dr Beneš was told at the Quai d'Orsay that the Allied Powers did not wish to "break bridges" by promising to the nationalities of Austria-Hungary that they would fight on until its complete destruction. It was only owing to the extreme exertions of Dr. Beneš that in the second answer to Wilson (January, 1917) the name of the Czechoslovaks was inserted among other nationalities to be "liberated from foreign domination." The view that the Dual Monarchy presented a useful counterpoise against Germany and that its integrity should be preserved to avert the danger of "Balkanisation" of Europe was pretty common in French circles of intellectuals, and it militated against Austria-Hungary's partition. There followed at least half a dozen attempts from these quarters to detach Austria-Hungary from Germany and to conclude a separate peace with her. The Pope was against the destruction of a Catholic Power. The Socialists and the pacifists did not wish to prolong the war for far-going national pretensions. The bankers did not want the basis of their Danubian market to be broken in pieces. But first and foremost, the victory of the Allies remained uncertain. They would be satisfied with some kind of federation in Austria-Hungary. As for Vienna, the Court of the young Emperor Karl was ready to meet these peaceful dispositions halfway. Under such conditions the political parties in Prague disavowed Beneš's action abroad by their declarations of loyalty to Austria-Hungary and to the dynasty.

#### IV

Prof. Masaryk and Dr. Beneš did not despair of their cause. But during these days, the darkest in their struggle, their national

idea received a wider support and a more international expression. the sweeping formula of "self-determination" of nationalities in general. The transition was almost imperceptible. The Paris meetings of the Czechoslovak Foreign Committee were visited by professors, deputies, senators, journalists, representatives of the emigration of all unfree nations, Czechoslovaks, Jugoslavs, Poles, Ruthenes, Lithuanians, Estonians, Letts, Finns, Danes, Greeks. They all took part in the debates and made clear their common views about the probabilities of the Russian revolution and on the war in general. One naturally came to the conclusion that this war would bring with it freedom, not only for the Russian people, but for all oppressed nationalities, small and great, in an entirely reorganised Europe. The general scheme was now ready on its negative and also on its positive side. Prof. Masaryk has in a clear and masterly manner formulated it in his concluding Memoir of 1918, printed in manuscript under the title *L'Europe Nouvelle*, a kind of a manual or vade-mecum for such as were ready to propagate these ideas or had power to realise them. Masaryk here found brief expressions to characterise the conflicting strivings which divided Europe into two opposite camps. This was. "Democracy against Theocracy," a paraphrase for the Allied "Plan to organise democratically Europe and humanity." For the opposite side the formula was: "Berlin-Bagdad," which branded "the German plan for universal domination." Masaryk then explained the connection between the German aim and the idea of constructing a "Central Europe," including a region of oppressed nationalities covering all the ground between Austria-Germany and Russia. He pointed to the special place of Czechoslovakia, with its natural and historical frontiers, as a chief obstacle on the German route to "Bagdad" and the open way for its expansion toward the south and south-east, including the Balkans and Turkey, as was already shown in Naumann's book. The two leading ideas of destroying Austria-Hungary and liberating its "oppressed nationalities" thus found themselves put in the centre of the argument; they were logically tied together and presented as the "principal aim of the War."<sup>1</sup>

Dr. Beneš thought also of organising a public demonstration by the nationalities for the benefit of the principle of "self-determination." He chose Rome as the most convenient place for an

<sup>1</sup>The development of these ideas is clearly shown by a comparison with Mr. Seton-Watson's articles in "*The War and Democracy*" Macmillan, 1916.

international pageant After Caporetto and the advent of Orlando the "*politica di nazionalità*" gained ground in Italy, and the Congress of oppressed nationalities of Austria-Hungary took place in Rome on 9-11 April, 1918, with the connivance of the Italian Government and with the officially expressed sympathies of Paris and London. The resolution against Austria-Hungary and for the oppressed nationalities was carried according to the Czech desires.

The March revolution in Russia and the declaration of War by the United States on 12 April, 1918, entirely changed the situation. After so many blows and days of sorrow the Czechs had their days of success. Their chief contentions were accepted by the Allies; their government abroad and their armies were officially recognised. The war was verging to an end favourable to their aspirations.

## V

The battle was won on the side of ideas. Without false modesty Masaryk and Beneš could claim their part in the victory. How did Beneš explain just why this programme of his work proved victorious?

"We won the game," so he answers our question in his Memoirs, "because we knew how to place our cause exactly in the general frame of the universal *processus*. We were right in connecting our efforts with those of the European and World Democracy without pondering just where was to be sought the numerical or material superiority. We justly discerned the probabilities of the future, without abandoning ourselves to changing conjunctures. We unswervingly followed the line we chose by principle without resorting to the game of chance or imagination. On the contrary, while conscientiously weighing the realities of the day, with untiring effort we added stone after stone to the base of our success. It was our historical and philosophical conception of the war that gave us the right views of what we had to do and how it was to be done. This was the source of our strength and the secret of our success."

Dr. Beneš knows the habitual objection: according to it "our triumph was due to the world's political conjuncture. However, it is not mere chance that produces a conjuncture. The conjuncture was the same for everybody, but other people were unable to make use of it. This shows that it is not sufficient to know the conjuncture. One must understand its meaning and how to utilise it."

Beneš does not allude to himself. He gives the name of Masaryk. The true foresight of events was due to Masaryk's perspicacity. But not only that. Masaryk was "one of the few leading men who

incarnate the ideals of their time and of the time to come; who also know the traditions of their nation and its present aspirations "

Dr Beneš assimilated himself so much with Masaryk, his great master, that it would be extremely difficult to draw a line between the two in order to find the exact proportion of merit of each in their common achievement. But we must try to do this. The difference of age, distant by a whole generation, coupled with that of temperament, of itself draws the line between a thinker steeped in German philosophy and morals of the 19th century and a publicist open to the last impressions and doctrines of the 20th. Both become prominent statesmen, but Masaryk preserves something of his professional dignity, while Beneš is always ready for a political talk. The former keeps the habit of talking to his students, the latter prefers a debating society of intellectuals, and he soon becomes one of them. During the years of exile they are often divided by distance: Prague and Paris, Paris and London, Western Europe and Russia and Siberia, Europe and the United States of America. However, their thought is one, because their aim is one, and yet they treat the same questions a bit differently. national idea, internationalism, politics, even democracy. Masaryk, in a sense, comes from the national idea to an open struggle against Austria-Hungary, whose leading circles and decaying morality he knows too well from personal experience. Beneš denies Austria-Hungary as a whole, from the very beginning, and thence, gradually, he reaches his general conception of the national idea. Masaryk does not reflect much on his nationalism, it is in his heart; somehow he is born with it, and he finds the "soul" of his people in his own soul, while projecting its internal light, its religion and morals, into his people's historical past. Beneš interprets his national idea by the elements of the future. Here is Beneš's reasoning on "patriotism" "True patriotism understands that nation and national civilisation are, and must be, an expression of humanity, and that a beautiful, elevated and perfect humanity can only manifest itself through national civilisations. . . . That is why there is no contradiction between national feeling and that of humanity. They complete each other like the face and the reverse of a pure golden coin. To me patriotism can never be so ardent, so fervent and strong as when it is conscious of expressing and completing the great universal moral principle." The idea is here that of Masaryk; both have it from Herder; even the very term "humanity" is used by Masaryk in this connection. But the ex-

pression is different. It is more typical of Beneš' reason and not feeling speaks first

We can now better understand the personal part of Beneš in the above statement: "We won, because we knew how to place our cause in the general frame of the universal *processus*." They did it really, both of them, but Beneš put into it his special view of the contents of this "process" of democratic development. "Politically, Europe since the 15th century follows a unified line of development. Humanism, Renaissance, Reformation built the basis for modern individualism. The philosophy of Descartes and of the English Liberals and French Encyclopædists prepare that development until it finds its issue in the American and, finally, the French Revolution, while it destroys feudal and aristocratic conceptions and introduces constitutionalism. America and the entire West of Europe create the modern man free from absolutist chains; they proclaim the philosophy of humanity, the feeling of awe before the human personality—a philosophy of political and social equality and of complete democracy." There is not a single word in this quotation from Beneš to which Masaryk could not subscribe, and yet he would have written it differently, with a little less sociology, perhaps, and a little more philosophy.

It would be wrong to think, though, that, according to Dr. Beneš, the war brought "Humanity," through this "royal road" of Democracy, within reach of the gate of the Democratic Paradise. Whatever the transports of hope of the young enthusiast, a few years of experience would have brought him to a larger insight. This is his final view of the war as summarised in the conclusion of his *Memoirs* (1928): "Of course, it is not easy to find a synthetic expression for all substantial aspects of the world war. One must abstain from excessive schematisation, which tries to reduce the multifarious complexity of the war phenomena to some plain formula. The world war was such a tremendous social fact, so prodigiously complicated, so much intertwined with elements of politics, economics, technicalities, morals, psychology, biology, etc., that one single formula cannot explain its deep meaning without becoming too general—mere words deprived of precise content . . . It is necessary to know what were the ideas and interests that prevailed in its course, what were the positive results it attained, what was its end, and it is to be judged in the light of the post-war crisis."

Nor did Dr. Beneš conceal from himself, what difficulties were in store for him, in the light of this crisis, on the line of policy which he had chosen. Here are a few words on the subject, which mean

more than they say, I quote again from the conclusion of the Memoirs "In order to lead the State in the future, we must discern the general lines of European development from momentary combinations of the States' interests—and especially from those of our neighbours. The former are the 'constants,' while the latter are passing contingencies. . . . The world war has shown us who are our adversaries, where they are to be sought, and what obstacles we shall have to overcome on the international ground. If the conquest of liberty was hard to attain, the task of preserving it will be still harder. In politics, it is easier to succeed than to make the success last. This is twice true when the liberty of a nation is at stake. One will see it at the first more or less grave international complication which we shall meet on our path. . . . We must then continue the policy under whose sign we won our liberty; inside, keep in peace with our ethnical minorities—and outside, with our neighbours. But at the same time we must be always ready to defend ourselves." The words now sound like a testament. But they were written ten years before the ordeal came, and five years before the advent of Herr Hitler to power.

## VI

After the war came the Peace Conference. Dr. Beneš was clearly indicated to represent there the interests of Czechoslovakia in its process of birth. Owing to his untiring exertions, together with those of Masaryk, there was not much left to be done at the Conference. The "historical" territory of independent Czechoslovakia was traced by a thousand years of its "Bohemian" history. Its limits coincided with the natural frontiers of the country, surrounded with a crown of mountains which helped to ward off so many invasions of the medieval barbarisms and preserved intact the Slav population, except for the deserted forests and mines, where kings and monasteries were building their big estates, aided by German colonists. It was in the interest of the Allies to preserve that territory untouched; it is only thus shaped that independent Czechoslovakia could justify Napoleon's saying: "Who possesses Prague, possesses Europe." The newly-formed Czechoslovak government, in its embryonic form of "The National Council" and the two nuclei of the national army, built up in Russia and in Italy, had already been recognised by France and England on 28 June, 1 July and 1 August, 1918. On 18 October, 1918, Woodrow Wilson replied to the last peace proposal of Austria-Hungary, that on the ground of the existence of such an independent army and

government he was unable to maintain his former proposal of giving Czechoslovakia "the largest possibilities of autonomous development" within Austrian precincts. There followed on 27 October the recognition of the Italian government. Things went so far that on 28 October a Czechoslovak delegation from Prague was permitted by the Austro-Hungarian government to meet in Geneva their members of the "National Council for Abroad"; the delegation did approve of all the proposals of their Parisian colleagues and the day 28 October, has since been considered as the historical date of the formal declaration of independence of the Czechoslovak Republic, with Masaryk as its President and Kramař as Premier of the newly completed Cabinet. Beneš had to take charge of Foreign Affairs, and in this official quality he had to act at the Peace Conference.

The time had passed when a French parliamentarian, after listening to Dr. Beneš's report on the destruction of Austria-Hungary, was heard to say: "a good fellow, but hopelessly foolish." Beneš was now much in advance of other candidates for "self-determination" who also asked the "Big Four" for a hearing, and whose aims were no longer considered as "foolish." He now called himself an "idealist-realist." I may be permitted to quote a witness, Dr. E. J. Dillon, a good observer, in order to show the impression produced by the newly promoted diplomatist, when he spoke before the Conference in defence of his cause:—

"One of the most remarkable debaters in this singular parliament, where self-satisfied ignorance and dullness of apprehension were so hard to pierce," writes Dr. Dillon, "was the youthful envoy of the Czechoslovaks, M. Beneš. This politician displayed a masterly grasp of Continental politics and a rare gift of identifying his country's aspirations with the postulates of a settled peace. A systematic thinker, he made a point of understanding his case at the outset. He would begin his *exposé* by detaching himself from all national interests and starting from general assumptions recognised by the Olympians, and would lead his hearers by easy stages to the conclusions which he wished them to draw from their own premisses. And two of them who had no great sympathy with his thesis assured me that they could detect no logical flaw in his argument. Moderation and sincerity were the virtues which he was most eager to exhibit, and they were unquestionably the best trump cards he could play. Not only had he a firm grasp of facts and arguments, but he displayed a sense of measure and open-mindedness which enabled him to implant his views on his hearers."

The picture is too vivid not to be true, with the exception, probably, that an old sceptic could not quite admit the part of "sincerity" in the newly acquired "realism" of Dr. Beneš.

Nor should one minimise the part of realism displayed, according to Dr. Dillon, by Dr. Beneš in his advocacy of Czechoslovakia's cause before the "singular" assembly that simply ignored the elements of it. It was here that "placing" the individual case "in a general frame" proved to be the best method for catching the ear of the hearers. A real statesman, Dr. Beneš says, not only has "great ideas," but he "knows the necessities of the day", "he does not make concessions in principle, but he is ready to compromise in his tactics, he does not put forward unrealisable proposals in order not to endanger the whole." Thus, "day by day, step by step, he reaches his ideal aim, which he never forgets"

## VII

After the "Peace Conference," the "Covenant of the League of Nations," its best creation. It has now become a habit to disparage the work of both of them. People who lived through those experiences cannot join in the chorus. They knew too well what had been before, and they hailed Versailles as well as Geneva, as a promise of a new and great epoch to come, introducing the spirit of democratic justice into the chaos of international life. So much the more Beneš, the "optimist." He has just achieved the two great aims he pursued: Czechoslovakia is free, Austria-Hungary has ceased to exist. The new task will now be to organise, to preserve and to stabilise both national and international acquisitions. The League of Nations is the best place for this kind of activity, which, in fact, is a direct continuation of the former. The connection between the two is clear for one who took such a prominent part in the first, and prepares to develop his work in the second. As early as 1922 Dr. Beneš writes: "The League of Nations had its origin in the greatest war known in history. This war overthrew four great Empires, changed the political, economic, social and moral structure of Europe, gave life to a series of new States, abolished the power of a series of dynasties, ruling classes and castes, set in motion large working masses, which caused great overthrows in certain States. This is the situation in which the League of Nations was created." The "frame" is much larger in which the defence of the national cause must now be placed, but it is of the same style as before. The "Covenant" of the League of Nations is for Dr. Beneš "more than an expression of the idealistic



spirit of a few individuals. It is a real product of intellectual, political and cultural development achieved, by stages, through three great Revolutions—the English, the American and the French . . . To me the Covenant is a mark of political and social progress, the realisation of a new international life, new order, new morals and politics, the culminating point of the new ideology of the 18th, 19th and 20th centuries.” Dr. Beneš will serve the Covenant, while trying to make it approach still more to the ideal. He will almost identify himself with the work in Geneva and make himself a still more acceptable, necessary, important member than had been the case in Versailles. These people know him already, and he has learnt to know them in his turn.

In 1924 Czechoslovakia was chosen by the League as a (non-permanent) member of its Council. Beneš had to represent his country. He sat on the Committees, was chosen to report on most important matters, functioned as chosen president in some sessions of the Council, was four times re-elected—in 1924–27—the years which he characterises as the period of the tensest activity of the League. His difficulties began from 1927, when Germany joined the League and got a permanent seat on the Council. They found Dr. Beneš not only a *cheville ouvrière* of the Council, a sort of master mover, but also a leading spirit, rich in imagination and creative force. Whatever the obstacles, Dr. Beneš always “had his plan” and mostly carried it through by unanimous consent of his colleagues. But he also took part in a daring idea, shared by a few; it was embodied in the so-called “Geneva Protocol of 1924,” and it was there that he first met with the obstacle which proved insurmountable. Had it been accepted, it would have represented the acme of all improvements of the “Covenant.” The page devoted to the “Protocol” in Beneš’s writings reads almost like a lyrical poem. “It was the first really universal conception . . . a bold, in a sense a grandiose, experiment. As such, it became, naturally, an object of fanatical defence on one side and of so many attacks and certain derision on the other. In many quarters it is now considered dead. But that cannot be dead which lives continuously in its principles and ideals and day after day wins its existence in battle, being at least partly realised in international practice,” etc. (1928).

What then was the matter? Some earlier pacifist organisations bore the title of “Leagues to *enforce* peace.” The Covenant of the League did not satisfy this claim, because it did not contain any formal *obligation* for its members to come to the aid of the State subjected to an unprovoked foreign invasion. The “Protocol”

intended to "shut up the holes" left open in the Covenant to such an unpunished aggression. As long as the aggression could remain unpunished, there was no "security" for the members of the League, and without security no "disarmament" was possible—even according to the limited commentary of Article 8 of the Covenant. "Security first"—France repeatedly insisted. "No, disarmament first," England answered. "Security guaranteed by obligatory assistance," extended beyond the provisions of the Covenant, proposed the "Protocol." In cases of conflict the procedure of arbitration and the decisions of the permanent Court of Justice within its competence, must be accepted as obligatory by the members. The League must be authorised to take all sanctions necessary for execution of the decisions of the Council. Individual members were thus encouraged to resort to armed intervention against the "aggressor" in case the Council were unable to come to a unanimous decision. Twenty States signed the "Protocol" presented by Beneš in his quality of President of the Third Committee of the League (for Disarmament), and the way was thus paved for the opening of the "Conference" on Disarmament. It was to meet on June, 1925. But in March Mr. Austin Chamberlain, then Foreign Minister, laid his protest against the obligatory character of arbitration and against the increase of obligations imposed on the members of the League. The Council was thus obliged, in December, to postpone the "Conference," and organised instead a "preparatory commission." Commission after commission, security against disarmament, France against England and Germany, Litvinov against everybody—the fate of the "Protocol" was sealed. On the other hand Dr. Beneš was right in insisting that questions of limitation of armaments and security could not be silenced by the failure of the "Protocol," and would return at every step of international politics. But he saw now that the Covenant could not be substantially changed, and that other means would have to be tried in order to find at least a partial solution.

The League was not to be transformed into a sort of "Superstate," according to the dream of the pre-war pacifists. Nor was its general assembly to become an "international parliament," where the peoples would be directly represented. It was only a "sum of States," to use Dr. Beneš's expressions—a "forum" where 56 States had to search for common expression of their independent wills. Great or small or intermediate, they had to remain equal. "A League," wrote Dr. Beneš, "where the principle of equality of members would be rejected and a hierarchy of States

or even the hegemony of certain Great Powers would prevail instead, would be no more a League of Nations." This was also the principle which tacitly underlay the "Protocol", and in an equally hidden way, raised the objections of the "Big" States. Among those who were chiefly represented by professional diplomatists, Dr. Beneš, one of the few "intellectuals" and newcomers, found himself in a delicate position. He was always suspected of belonging to the set of abstract theoreticians, and his campaign for the "Protocol" increased the suspicion "It was hinted to me personally during that work," he recollects, "that either it was due to my idealistic naïvety or that simply I did not mean it seriously, was insincere and so on. Neither the one nor the other objection is true I am not so naïve as to ignore what was realisable in all that action and what was not,—which problems our State and the whole world can and must solve; nor is it true that especially we (Czechs) were insincere in taking up this action. On the contrary, if the general problem of limitation of armaments could be solved, it would be of use for us and for everybody. An insincere game it was for such as look at politics as a kind of licensed deceit. Myself, I do not understand or practise politics in this sense." He then proceeds to justify the League against attacks "In general," he states, "the whole work of the League provokes disparaging utterances as to its incapacity, deficiencies and failures . . . not to mention certain stronger expressions. . . . I know myself that the League's activity is open to criticism and that its organisation has its weak sides. I know it probably better than other people because I have had the chance of seeing it more closely. But, on the other hand, I see that the exertions of the League for limitation of armaments represent a strong, important and lasting movement. Our earlier idea of an eternal peace may be an illusion But we must continue struggling for peace—everywhere, by all means . . . It is impossible to look at these things superficially or superciliously . . ."

No, Dr. Beneš was neither "naïve nor insincere," but he was a Czech patriot, and he had to defend the interests of a small nation. In fact all members of the League had to do the same, and this was the substance of the objections to the "Protocol" on the part of the Great Powers which wished to preserve their supreme guidance, through the Council of the League, in their quality of victors and authors of the new order in Europe. Similar difficulties and objections appeared when, in 1926-27, the question arose of the "democratisation" of the Council itself by completing the "pentarchy" of the Covenant with new permanent, half-permanent

and temporary members, who would enjoy equal rights of vote with the acknowledged Great Powers. It was in September, 1925, that Ramsay Macdonald pronounced his warning on the subject of the "Protocol": "If certain obligations should be imposed," he said, "there will ensue the dismemberment of the League and a great number of the remaining affiliated nations would make such reservations that the obligation accepted would lose all value." Ten years later, in 1935, the same Mr. Macdonald signed in Rome the draft for the famous "Pacte à Quatre," intended to free the Great Powers from the League in their action for the "revision" of treaties and the realisation of "equal rights" for Germany. Of course, after six subsequent revisions of Mussolini's draft and three counter-projects the League was re-established in its rights, the obligation to respect the territorial integrity and political independence of *all* members was restored according to the Covenant, and Mussolini's attempt was defeated. But the idea of it remained alive. Dr. Beneš understood the tendency of "revisionism" very well, and in time. He knew that here, "one of the most serious questions of present international politics was raised: the question of relations between the small and the great States in Europe of today." And he did not wait for this question to be put on the order of the day. He had to care for the security of his own country.

### VIII.

As early as 1920, i.e. before even the structure of the League was definitely worked out Dr. Beneš thought of organising separately the zone of the small nations, now liberated and reunited, in Central Europe. Naturally enough, his Czechoslovakia stood in the centre, and the neighbouring States were the first to be joined in some form of common contact. Of course, there stood in the first place such of them as had gained from victory, while their opponent was one who suffered the largest losses: Hungary. There were about 750,000 Magyars who passed to Czechoslovakia, 450,000 to Yugoslavia, 1,300,000 to Roumania. Sympathies in France were not quite dead for Hungary, and the idea of re-establishment of a "Danube federation" had its adherents chiefly among "les hommes d'affaires" and bankers engaged in economics. On the political side the danger came from the attempts at restoration of the Habsburg dynasty on the throne of St. Stephen. The place in Europe left void by the fall of Austria-Hungary was to be filled up somehow, as soon as possible. The "oppressed" nations which were now liberated were the first candidates. They were already united in spirit by

democratic ideology of the war worked out in common. Dr. Beneš, who, together with Masaryk, was the principal promoter and mouth-piece of this ideology, had now to continue his work by organising a new "Central Europe" without Austria and Hungary. Thus was the "Little Entente" born, which title shows that it had to act in harmony with the "Great" one, while working in the same direction and for the very same aim, to strengthen the cause of peace in Europe. To be sure, Dr. Beneš wished the "Little Entente" to become an "independent" creation. He strongly objects to the "legend" that they were to be "vassals" of France; he even underlines in his article on the "Little Entente" that he did not warn France of his preparations to sign on 14 August, 1920, in Belgrade the first "Little Entente" treaty, which he himself had "conceived." On the other hand, the text of the Treaty sets concisely as its chief aim defence against an "unprovoked attack on the part of Hungary," with the work of peace "foreseen by the League of Nations." And in the article just quoted Dr. Beneš recognises the leading part that France played in the history of the "Little Entente." "Paris understood us first and last," he says. "In the difficult time after the war France always stood on our side, whatever the question—during the struggle against the Habsburgs, at the Conference of Genoa, in economic and financial complications, in the League of Nations, in the questions of 'revisionism,' reparations, post-war debts. In most cases the interests of France and these States were identical." This was written in 1934.

However, it cost some pains for Dr. Beneš to introduce the "Little Entente" into the League, as its *annexe*. The general feeling was against such independent formations which might be tempted to carry on a separate line of policy. The objection was serious enough, but Dr. Beneš succeeded in persuading the assembly to accept his amendment to Article XXI to the effect of admitting certain separate accords between the members of the League not only with its approval but even "under its auspices," on the condition that they conform with the stipulations of the Covenant and serve its aims. However, Dr. Beneš firmly believed that a "block of 45 million men," which "before all rests on its own strength," can function as an independent factor in European policy if it is "given time" to coalesce "in peace and security." The question was whether this condition would be realised.

This fundamental question was not easy to answer, even for an "optimist" like Dr. Beneš. He understands that "peace and quiet in Europe depend on the relations between England, France,

Germany and Italy" It is "the voice of the Great Powers" that is responsible for war and peace in Europe That is why "circumstances always oblige us to co-operate with some European Great Power" "Any European and general catastrophe will surely bring us into trouble." The result, however, can be modified (1) by the influence of such European States as Poland, those in Central Europe and in the Balkans, (2) by the policy of the League; (3) by one's own military force. Now, since 1929, and especially since 1931-33—Hitler's advent in Berlin—this pedestal of hope was obviously weakening. "Lastly there appeared again in political circles of certain Great Powers schemes for partition among them of the spheres of influence: one has in view especially the countries of Central Europe Czechoslovakia and the Little Entente are against such a policy of the Great Powers, and object to it. . . . They will not let themselves become spheres of influence, an object of other States' foreign policy. This policy led to the catastrophe of 1914, and would today bring about a similar catastrophe" In another place Dr. Beneš gives more details of such schemes which "chiefly developed in the second half of 1932." "The Pact of the Four" was only a partial expression of such schemes, but, should it "be realised in its original form, it would obviously be used for a similar development of Europe." Dr. Beneš seems even to know the contents of the schemes mentioned Britain was to rule over her Colonial Empire, like France. Italy received her sphere of influence in Central Europe, while Germany was to be left free to continue her "Drang nach Osten," to the Baltic States and to South-Eastern Europe. Nowadays the "scheme" is somewhat changed; but the tendency remains the same as stated by Dr. Beneš some ten years ago. Its meaning is a "retreat to pre-war tendencies in the policy of the Great Powers." The movement is directed "against international pacifism, against democracy in international politics, against the interests of the small States," and, of course, against the spirit of the League of Nations. Should the partition of "spheres" take place, the Versailles "treaties be revised," the questions of frontiers solved by a series of compromises—the limitation of armaments might become possible, and, although the interests of the small States would be sacrificed, there would be "nothing left to them but to submit and accept the new order of things."

No, Dr. Beneš would not submit. As early as "the first vibrations of a general crisis in Europe" were felt, in 1929-30, the Little Entente met in order to strengthen its organisation. They

proceeded to systematise their economic relations, and in 1932-33 they signed their act of closer union—the "Permanent Council." After the retreat of Germany from the League of Nations (14 October, 1934) they decided to approach the Soviets, and took part in the invitation to the USSR to enter the League. In 1935 Czechoslovakia joined the Franco-Soviet treaty of 2 May, and took part in the negotiations of democratic Powers in order to extend to Eastern Europe the guarantees of western frontiers given by the Locarno Treaties. It is known that this attempt to build up an "Eastern Locarno" and to conclude an "indivisible peace" served as a signal for Hitler to enter the latest phase of his policy of aggression. There begins the series of his systematic encroachments, which leads to the "Anschluss" and the partition of Czechoslovakia.

## IX.

Dr. Beneš is now accused of not having foreseen the danger that was accumulating over his country. We have just seen that this is not true. In his objective, impartial, broadly-historical way of thinking he very well understood the origin of the approaching menace to destroy everything that he had been fighting for since the days of his youth—not only for Czechoslovakia, but for European democracy in general. He discerned clearly and explained to us in advance the deeper causes of what had to come. "We live in a time," he wrote, "which is typical of periods of transition from one historical epoch to another. Such periods are always times of crises, difficulties, of political, social, economic and moral disorganisation." "The world war brought with it a great revolution: it solved in a positive sense the three problems of democracy, nationality and of social equality and justice." However, "each revolution bears in itself the germs which generate counter-revolution. This is the law of sociology, which is regularly confirmed by inevitable historical experiences. In its first uprise every revolution overleaps its aim and loosens the bands of collective feelings and instincts further than reasonable principle of a rightly thinking statesman would approve." "When the first storm is over, all forces of the past, for a while in retreat, come back to the surface. This explains why democracy seems to verge on its decline, and such principles as pacifism, internationalism, co-operation and solidarity among the nations sadly suffer defeats after defeats." The appearance of dictatorships in Russia, Germany and Italy, as well as the crisis of democracy in minor States, are also explained in the same way. A feeling of moral disorientation then takes

possession of hearts, minds and heads of thinking people. That is why also a new generation has arisen which has lost equilibrium, is bound to be guided by instinct and "biology," is passionate, uncertain, filled with anguish, inclined to personal enjoyment and to egotistical strivings, to intolerant party ideals, to fanatical exaggeration of crime, and extreme social movements

All this is, of course, beyond the reach of a politician. However, Dr Beneš, the "optimist," is satisfied to think that this unhealthy post-war psychology is a temporary and passing phenomenon "No social organism can live long in such an unhealthy condition." In the meantime the danger is there, and it works consciously against democratic ideals

Concerning his own country, the apprehensions of Dr. Beneš are not so strong. He knows his people as healthy and self-restrained. But there is a flaw in Czechoslovakia which contains in it a serious menace. It comes from internal national relations. The country is not ready to meet the danger because it lacks unity. It is the result of its too recent unification on the basis of the national idea. To acquire its national unity England needed ten centuries of historical life, France, eleven, German and Italian unity originates in the French Revolution, while the Czechoslovak, Roumanian and Yugoslav processes of unification date from the World War and from the events of 1918. No wonder that, after fourteen years of life in common, they did not quite reach the consciousness of their national unity. They have full right to be given time to mind their own affairs in peace and security. On the other hand, Dr. Beneš relies on the results of demographic processes. In some 30-40 years Czechoslovakia will have as many as twenty million inhabitants, Yugoslavia, twenty. Then "our historical problem of being small nations will entirely disappear." The fear of 60-70 million Germans will also vanish, a fifteen-million nation cannot disappear or be denationalised. At the same period of time the Magyars will reach hardly ten to twelve million, and the growth of the German people will remain stationary. These demographic changes will gradually displace the axis of European policy in the direction of Central and Eastern Europe.

Do all these previsions and perspectives make Dr. Beneš feel safe as to the possibilities on the part of the enemy to prevent and to overthrow his calculations? Not in the least. He sometimes says so, and repeats it—from his responsible post. President Masaryk, when I last saw him before his death, told me: "I look quiet, but they do not know what I feel inside"—with a gesture to his heart.



Nor do I know what was in the heart of the second President before the latest events. But this is how he spoke out his mind while addressing his nation on the subject of its national unity (written in 1934-35): "They must understand that the present evolution of Europe obliges them to abolish their pernicious particularism and to create finally their complete national union . . . . Otherwise they may lose their opportunity for ever. The wheel of history will pass over them and will crush them without mercy. Even a blind man can see that there rise around us the forces of reaction and of national expansion whose first aim will be to encroach on our frontiers, while fostering discords and contradictions among us in order to split us politically and as a State, and finally bring us back to what we had been before 1914." . . . "It would be not only absurd, but really tragic." . . . "The Slovaks, too, must put aside their illusions and fight against their political romanticism, but for the Czechs, they would all be bruised between the Magyars, Poles and Germans." What about the Sub-Carpathian Russia—one of the most important questions in all the politics of Central Europe? "Czechoslovakia will never forget her obligations"; but she had to take care lest "the minority rule the majority," and the local government "become undemocratic." And he goes on arguing and arguing while he himself wavers between hope and despair, despair and hope.

## X.

We come thus to the last accusation against Dr. Beneš, which is quite concrete; that directly before the events of 21-30 September he was unable to foresee that Czechoslovakia would become the victim of the historical changes in European politics just mentioned, in spite of his being repeatedly warned by his official representatives and friends that in case of an "unprovoked aggression" by Germany no help would be given to him by the Allies, although they were bound to do so by the existing treaties.

The accusation is difficult for an outsider to answer in the heat of emotion produced by the downfall of the State which owes its independent existence, in a great measure, to Masaryk's and Beneš's personal exertions. On the face of it, it is devoid of the noble instincts of respect and thankfulness due to the founders of the Republic. But let alone the moral side of it, the very fact in question needs elucidation, which can only be the result of a careful historical study in full possession of authentic documents unknown to us. However, it would be equally impossible and unfair to abstain from any

judgment on the matter Let me express my personal opinion, although it can only be a more or less probable approximation

Dr Beneš must have known the untoward news sent in to him by Ministers, friends and present accusers He knew all this much better—and probably earlier—than all these people. What could he do? What should be the line of action to choose in the light of that information? How much different could it have been from that actually chosen?

Let us not complicate the answer by returning to the influence of the general situation on the political attitude taken up by Dr. Beneš, in harmony with his previous democratic line of action Enough has been said on this subject, and confirmed by Dr. Beneš's genuine utterances cited in this article I should only add one of the last pronouncements of Dr. Beneš on Czechoslovakia's relations to Germany, made in his speech at České Budejovice as late as 1937. "Our policy," he said, "has always aimed at keeping a good entente with all States without discriminating between their regimes, or their internal policies, or the parties in power. This is why we have so often declared that we were against the formation of ideological blocks, and that in the same way the Little Entente has many times manifested its firm decision not to join any of these fronts. On the other hand, we have remained true to our friendships, to the policy of the League of Nations and to the Little Entente's obligations. However, all this does not impede us from coming to agreement with our neighbours, Germany, Poland, Hungary and other States. A good external policy must discern permanent forces and possibilities, follow their evolution . . . and search for ways of co-operation in spite of difficulties that may arise in an improvised way" (see above). Dr. Beneš could not possibly go beyond these statements, but he was facing the determined policy of renewed Pan-Germanism.

Were the difficulties he met with in 1938 "improvised" by that very well-known source of determination? Of course, in a sense, they were, but they did not come unexpectedly, especially after the campaign started by Herr Hitler in February and March, 1938, both against Austria and Czechoslovakia (his Reichstag speech on 20 February and Schuschnigg's answer on 24 February; Göring's speech on 1 March and Hodža's answer on 4 March, Beneš's declaration on the next day: "We are ready to defend by armed hand the integrity of our territory and our democratic ideal"). The methods of "improvisation" were also made clear by the annexation of Austria on 13 March, after France had first encouraged the

"plebiscite" (9 March), and then withdrew her support. On the next day M. Paul-Boncour confirmed to Mr. Osusky the validity of the French obligations to defend Czechoslovakia, on the 16th Stojadinović, in the Skupština, and Litvinov gave similar confirmations, while on 24 March Mr. Chamberlain, in the House of Commons, said the support of England was probable in case of an extension of war, but not automatic, and independent of treaty obligations. At that moment the campaign in the Sudeten had already begun; on 25 March Henlein put forward a demand for new elections, and Hlinka declared for the autonomy of Slovakia, to which demand Hodža answered (on 28 March) that "the question of minorities will be solved on a constitutional basis, without any pressure from abroad," and the Slovak majority parties declared themselves for Czechoslovak unity (on the 31st). On 24 April Henlein formulated his renowned Karlsbad demands, and the Czechoslovak Government (on 27 April) found them unacceptable.

Did Herr von Schuschnigg, under the conditions mentioned, not "foresee" the Anschluss of Austria? Of course he did; and although he was a fervent pro-German, he tried to prevent it by negotiations, by a plebiscite, by the force of arms—equally unsuccessful, because at the last moment Paris and Rome kept silence. He had not to "change his policy," because his policy was not anti-German, it was only "Austrian." Hitler's recourse to force was too obvious in that case, and even German justice did not seem to find any "fault" in Schuschnigg's unconditional surrender.

Could Dr. Beneš since March "foresee" what was in store for his country? He had long foreseen the possibility of German encroachment on the Czechoslovak frontiers (see above), and he now repeatedly stated that Czechoslovakia was ready to defend herself by arms. At the same time Hodža was prepared to make concessions to the nationalities by constitutional means. France and England still kept their protective hand over the allied and friendly State, which had received its frontiers by their assent and whose integrity was guaranteed by international procedure. Were their repeated assurances sincere? At that moment nothing seemed to prove that they were not to be relied upon, maybe because the necessity of their realisation seemed, as yet, remote. Anyhow, they were used to encourage resistance, and in no way to encourage a "change of policy."

If a test of the validity of these obligations was needed it was given a few days later, after the Czechoslovak refusal to comply

with Henlein's demands. Herr Hitler had, obviously, decided to proceed to serious preparations for aggression. He was massing troops in the proximity of the Czechoslovak frontiers. Later on, in his Nuremberg speech of 12 September, he denied the fact, declaring it to be Dr Beneš's "invention." However, the British diplomacy, seeing the increasing danger of conflict, spent all the month of May in exertions to persuade both parties to moderation. Prague responded by declaring itself ready for the utmost concessions possible, and was preparing a new "statute of nationalities." Berlin continued its preparations, and on 20 May, in answer to Sir Neville Henderson's question about the cause of military movements, assured him that Britain need not be anxious about them as there was nothing abnormal. Next day Sir Neville Henderson had twice to warn Herr Ribbentrop of the growing disquiet in London. The Czech Government, on its side, sent troops to Sudetenland. Dr. Beneš advised the population to keep quiet and repeated the promise to extend equal rights to nationalities on the basis of the constitution. On 22 and 28 May the municipal elections, on which German hopes of causing trouble were based, passed quite quietly. Herr Henlein accepted Mr. Hodža's invitation to negotiate and the German soldiers withdrew. Herr Hitler's explanation at Nuremberg was that it was another Czech invention that their withdrawal was due to the "intervention of Great Britain and France." But he added to this that "a Great Power cannot suddenly submit a second time to such a base attack," thus confirming the continuity of his effort and the truth of the allegations denied by him. Directly after that, he "took very serious measures on 28 May," and he told us at Nuremberg what was their purport. He even exaggerated when saying that "since 28 May the most gigantic fortifications that ever existed were under construction" towards the western frontier. He added that "before the beginning of winter Germany's fortifications in the west will be finished," and that "behind this front of steel and concrete . . . there stands a German people in arms." In his bombastic style he opposed his tactics to those of "Herr Beneš," who "indulges in tactics and speeches" and "tries to organise negotiations to clear up questions of procedure on the lines of Geneva," which "cannot go on for ever," as "it is not for Herr Beneš to give gifts to the Sudeten Germans." To the address of the "democracies" he directed this undisguised menace: "Should they be convinced that they must in this case protect with all their means the oppressors of Germans, then they will have to meet grave consequences. . . . I do not leave any doubt about this. . . .

We should regret it if thereby our relations with other European nations should suffer harm. But we are not to be blamed."

Well, the "democracies" seemed to be "convinced" by these preparations and menaces to change their mind as to the opportuneness of using "all their means." They did not do anything beyond opposing to the "front of steel" a very peaceful message. At the beginning of August there came to Prague, first as an observer, and then as a "mediator"—Lord Runciman. I have a great respect for Lord Runciman, whom I personally learnt to know in 1916; but I must say that the choice was very inappropriate considering the gravity of the moment, and it contributed only to deteriorate very much the unstable position. Without knowledge of the internal situation, of historical antecedents, of language and people, Lord Runciman brought with him certain predilections—he even said "much sympathy with the Sudeten race"—and friendly connections with the local higher aristocracy which was pro-German and whose hospitality he enjoyed during his week-ends. However, he tried to remain impartial. He was much satisfied with a "new basis for negotiation" which was the so-called "Fourth Plan" worked out by the Czech Government under unceasing Allied pressure: in his opinion "this plan embodied almost all the requirements of the Karlsbad eight points" of Henlein. And yet, "little doubt remained in his mind that *the very fact that they* (the conditions for further negotiations) *were so favourable*, operated against their chances with the more extreme members of the Sudeten German Party." He felt sure that "responsibility for the final break must rest upon Henlein, Frank, and *upon those . . . outside the country who were urging them* to extreme unconstitutional action." Lord Runciman did not see that practically a great part of the responsibility for this abrupt passage to increased demands supported by unconstitutional action rested upon himself—and especially so after he had given advice to his Government to yield. He was sincerely convinced that further cohabitation of Germans and Czechs became impossible after the few months of Herr Henlein's propaganda; however, it had proved possible after hundreds of years of historical experience, and myself, during my two summers' stay in Joachimsthal (Jachimov), I did not remark anything like the "tortures" which Herr Hitler spoke about. There remained a certain feeling among Germans and Slavs, there may have been a certain preference given to Czech elements on the part of the Government and the local administration, but under Masaryk's guidance the general tendency was to promote mutual toleration

and Herr Henlein's venomous propaganda could not have had any success without foreign interference.

Where, then, was a chance left for Dr. Beneš to prevent the worst consequences of the German fury, the *furor teutonicus*, which counted on a forcible solution? The Czechs had yielded and yielded; they "once more gave way" at the last moment, according to Lord Runciman's testimony. But what was the use of yielding? The same mediator tells us that after having "done his best to promote" the agreement, and "even after having had some success" in it, he remained "not without misgiving as to whether when the agreement was reached it could ever be carried out without giving rise to a new crop of suspicions, controversies, accusations and counter-accusations." "I felt," he concludes, "that *any such arrangement would be temporary and not lasting.*" I wonder whether Lord Runciman now sees that the same observations apply to negotiations inspired by himself—not between the Czech Government and Herr Henlein, but between Mr. Chamberlain and Herr Hitler. Only the tempo was changed. Instead of counting in months and years one had to count in days and minutes. . . . There was also another difference. Instead of "Herr Beneš" with his "Geneva methods" of procrastination, there were the panic-stricken "non-diplomatists" of Berchtesgaden, Godesberg and Munich. But this is just why Herr Hitler's disparaging utterances on Dr. Beneš were crowned with success. They made it impossible for the President of the Czechoslovak Republic to remain further at his responsible post after his policy was to be "changed" for an opposite one—to the great detriment of the cause of democracy in Europe. I do regret that Paris and London had no chance of profiting by Dr. Beneš's, better knowledge of the situation and his stronger "nerves" in carrying on difficult negotiations. Democratic Europe will have to pay a heavy price for the deficiency of its representatives at a most critical moment, while Czechoslovakia—the true friend, and the only obstacle to German expansion in Central Europe, the Czechoslovakia saved by Masaryk and Beneš in the World War from Teutonic captivity, promoted by both of them at Versailles to watch over the international equilibrium of the "New Europe," made by Dr. Beneš a prominent member of the League of Nations, strengthened by him through its leading part in the Little Entente—this Czechoslovakia ceased to exist in a few hours of inadvertent concessions at Munich.

PAUL MILYUKOV.

Paris, November, 1938.

I *President Beneš's Broadcast to the Nation* (10 Sept 1936).

Dear Fellow Citizens,

I speak to you at a moment of international difficulties, the greatest since the war, affecting not only the States of Europe, but other portions of the globe. I speak to you of ourselves and our position in this excited world, and I speak to all of you, Czechs and Slovaks, Germans and other nationalities, and among them to all parties, groups and camps. I speak to you above all as men and women who want quiet and peace and who respect in others human dignity and good will. Hence today I shall deliberately not speak in detail of the situation or of international questions.

Our Republic has during its whole 20 years developed in quiet and in a progressive spirit, it achieved political democracy and freedom, economic prosperity, cultural progress, religious tolerance and social justice, step by step, without crises, Putsches or revolutions, by peaceful paths. What elsewhere caused dangerous dislocation and even upheavals, was solved among us by agreement, without blind passion and on practical lines. We have had only one really serious problem, which has been with us for centuries and has constantly required new forms for its solution—namely, the problem of nationalities.

But this too we endeavoured to solve in an evolutionary sense. I shall not recount the various attempts which we made to solve it on calm lines—but I frankly admit the fact that today the swift course of events in Europe and the world, from which we cannot isolate ourselves, forces us to adopt a quicker pace. That is the sense of all that we are attempting today. We alter our pace, but not the spirit in which this State tries to solve its problems—namely, an honest effort to attain such a degree of political justice as is attainable in a practical way. This is the spirit of sincere democracy. In it the Government entered negotiations with representatives of the various nationalities of our Republic, and above all with the Sudeten German Party, as the strongest group. The Plan prepared by our constitutional factors of course holds good for all inhabitants of this State, and matters will be discussed with the other representatives of our nationalities also.

These questions and the principles on which the solution is based, have been published today. A considerable part of this material was already contained in the Nationalities Statute of this spring. The Government proposal, it is true, was not in the form of a law, like that Statute: it is submitted in the form of an agreement on the principles of the new settlement—but these are worked out in still further detail, in order to meet possible anxiety or distrust, lest this or that matter is not sufficiently guaranteed or seriously meant.

It contains certain matters not included in the original plan. These too are worked out in such a way as to give to the State what is the State's, and to the nationalities what is their due. It corresponds with the

democratic tradition of this Republic, that both in the State administration and in self-government, all rights are guaranteed to the individual and to the minority—freedom of opinion, rights of nationalities and just conditions for political, cultural and economic activity. This applies equally to the Czech and German minorities, to the Slovak, Magyar, Ruthene or Polish.

By the realisation of these proposals a real equality is to be assured to all citizens and nationalities of this State, as follows from our democratic ideas and institutions, and in such a way that every nationality shall occupy in the State the position that is his due according to numerical strength. In this sense the special problems of Slovakia will also be solved. This is possible for a people which forms a two-third majority of the population, which is itself healthy and firm, a people so patriotic, so determined, so capable of endurance, so sober in its views.

In the last few days I have received from Czechs and Germans, and from abroad, hundreds of communications which confirm this opinion: and if in some of them there is a certain doubt, that only relates to the question whether this is the right moment, when mutual suspicion prevails and political passions are unchained. To this I would answer, that I believe the new proposals to be for the advantage of the State in its further development, and that a renewal of co-operation between all nationalities will not endanger its unity, safety or integrity. In the future it will be the task of us all to prevent this from happening. And I lay special stress on the fact that its democratic structure and policy will not be altered. On the contrary, if international events develop in a manner favourable to us, that may strengthen and improve our democracy.

These proposals follow logically from the development of the nationalities problem in all Europe. It is our special conditions which force us to be the first in solving them. All the nationalities of our State are on a high cultural level, and the two most numerous in particular have a strong national consciousness and have made many contributions to general culture. It is therefore a matter of course that, in contrast to other Central European peoples, we must move forward swiftly. But we shall not be the last, the other States will also have the same troubles.

If we decide upon this settlement at a critical hour, when mutual confidence has been somewhat shaken, it is clear that we are making our sacrifice towards maintaining general peace. We are doing this consciously. We want to contribute towards removing European discord, and establishing good relations with all our neighbours, especially with our greatest neighbour Germany. We want to prove to Europe and America, especially to England and France, that we are clear as to our duty and are fulfilling it in so far as the necessities of our State permit.

If I, as President of the Republic, in agreement with the Government, today commend this solution to you, I appeal most earnestly to the whole population, and say that what is at stake is the restoration of confidence and co-operation between the two greatest nations of the Republic, and



a peaceful internal development. We shall thus be working towards preserving peace in Europe and the world at a very disturbed moment, but also for all that is dearest to us at home, for quiet in town and village, for house, working place and family.

But it is not only I in my official capacity and other responsible constitutional factors whose duty it is to work for peace: but all individual citizens have the same duty, each at his post. Each one of you, by his good will, by calm and the avoidance of conflicts and incidents, is doing a service to peace, just as he can, by excitable behaviour and provoking conflicts, seriously endanger peace not only here at home, but throughout Europe

In the last section of the proposed agreement there is the following passage: "In order that in these difficult times a peaceful development may be assured to the nationalities of the State and the immediate execution of this agreement may not be interfered with, the factors concerned are to endeavour to calm public opinion among the Czech and German population and create a better atmosphere in the sense of mutual understanding. This does not mean depriving anyone of the right to criticise and discuss political events or defend his views, interests and rights, but rather to create a new atmosphere and calm down the present combative spirit in press and propaganda, and thus to ensure that political discussions are conducted in a decent, loyal and objective manner."

I therefore appeal to all Czechoslovaks, all Germans and all other citizens without distinction of nationality. My appeal is not to the politicians and parties: in their case I take it as a matter of course. It is to the individual citizen.

Never before was the responsibility of each one of you greater than now. Be calm and reasonable, keep strong nerves. Go quietly about your daily work, this above all is what your country requires of you. The less you diverge from the customs of your daily life, the greater will be your contribution to the preservation of peace. Show the world that none of us wishes to take the responsibility of augmenting the present European tension. In this spirit I turn also to the press of all parties and races: its merit or guilt may be greater today than it perhaps supposes. For we are living through times in which all must stand together, so that on this earth where our fathers have peacefully built up for centuries past, we too may maintain peace. Are the Czechs and Sudeten Germans of today to destroy where their ancestors built up? The State must preserve the necessary strength to guarantee by all the means at its disposal order and discipline among the population. But it was the pride of our democracy, that it was always hitherto a disciplined democracy and that self-restraint was the guardian of peace. Why should this be changed today? I therefore desire a complete return to calm and order in loyal and disciplined competition of spirit and argument. I believe that nothing else is needed save moral strength, good will and mutual trust, for us to come together. I believe too that the Sudeten German

population genuinely demands peace and co-operate, just as I know this to be the case with the Czechs and Slovaks

I have good news as to the desire for normal conditions and peace on the part of all men of good will among our German fellow citizens. I receive daily many messages in this sense. They want peace, quiet, work, in honour and mutual good will. And therefore I believe that the present Government majority, on the basis of these proposals, will reach agreement with all nationalities and ensure further prosperous development.

If this aim is attained and national peace is happily restored, there can be only one urgent task for the Czechoslovaks—to restrict party quarrels, to hold together more than before, to act with loyalty and solidarity, and not to touch the idea of Czechoslovak unity. If we solve our national tasks in peace and mutual co-operation, our country will be one of the most beautiful, best administered, richest and justest countries on earth. Can there be anything more seductive for anyone living in this land? I believe that it is the yearning for such a future which is our chief link. Let us do what we can to bring it nearer

In speaking thus today to the population of this State, this is not from fear of what the future may bring. All my life I have never been afraid. I was always an optimist, and my optimism is today stronger than ever. I have an unquenchable belief in our State, its healthy character, its strength, its powers of resistance, its splendid army and the unbending spirit and devotion of its whole population. And I know that our State will come victorious out of the difficulties of today

Let us all then be full of steadfastness and faith. Let us preserve our calm and our belief in ourselves, in our State and its happy progress. Let us be ready for all sacrifices, but let us also be optimists in these most troublous times, and most important of all, let us never forget that faith and good will will move mountains, and that they will bring us safely out of all the confusions of Europe today.

## 2. *General Syrový's Broadcast* (5 Oct. 1938).

In the last few days our State and nation have received severe wounds. Deep as was its grief, the nation has shown a model discipline, such as strengthens the Government in the belief that it will succeed in extricating State and nation from its present need and leading it to new life. This task imposes on us all a high responsibility, readiness for sacrifice and extreme self-denial. With the grief of a thinking Czechoslovak citizen, with the bleeding heart of a legionary and soldier, I am now fulfilling one of the hardest tasks of my life, in informing you, my fellow citizens, that the President of the Republic, Dr. Beneš, has resigned his office, thus setting a noble example of self-sacrifice. His decision weighs so heavily, that words would be but a dull expression of our emotion.

## 3. *President Beneš's Farewell* (5 Oct. 1938).

I have just sent a letter to the Premier, resigning my office of President. And I turn to you, to say farewell as President, to our political colleagues,

to our splendid soldiers, to the legionaries and all with whom I worked. I have reached this decision after conferring with the constitutional factors, freely and as my own personal conviction. I had intended to do so immediately after the Munich decisions, but postponed it in order first of all to secure a stronger and more lasting government. And I believe that under present circumstances this is the right thing to do.

I have no intention of analysing the situation which led me to this decision. I will only emphasise that the whole post-war system of European balance has during the last few years changed to the disadvantage of ourselves and our friends. The Czechoslovak Republic, in agreement with its friends, had for years honestly striven to uphold this system and gradually to alter it by evolution. But in the last three years events moved with unexpected speed. We strained every effort when this evolution assumed with us the form of national conflicts, we tried genuinely to come to terms with the other nationalities, we went to the extreme limit of possible concessions. Foreign influence and the general European development led to a severe international conflict, in which we were left to the military defence of our frontiers. We all did this with energy, devotion and sacrifice, such as won the respect of friend and foe. It was clear that a general catastrophe might result. You know that under these circumstances the four Great Powers met together and came to terms as to the sacrifices to be demanded of us in the interest of world peace, and that we were forced to accept them.

I do not propose today to analyse or criticise these details in detail. Do not expect of me a single word of recrimination in any direction. History will one day pass its verdict and decide justly. I shall only say that we all feel the pain of it: the sacrifices so emphatically demanded of us are unbounded and are not just. The nation will never forget this, even though it bears it with dignity, calm and self-confidence. This shows the nation's strength, the moral greatness of its sons and daughters.

In this time I have, as in duty bound and with all devotion, defended the interests of our State and people and the position we have hitherto held in Europe. Those are in the wrong who have failed to see the hundreds of attempts we have made to preserve peace and establish good neighbourly relations, our genuine good will to come to terms with all those around us. The forces against this were too strong. I believe that under such circumstances it is good that the new development, the new European co-operation on our part, should not be hampered by the person of its highest representative. I was elected to my present post at an essentially different period. As a convinced democrat, I believe I am right in resigning.

We shall still remain democrats and work with our friends, but it is necessary to make the way open, so that our people can develop in its new milieu and adapt itself to the new conditions. That does not mean breaking away from the old friends, but winning new ones.

Our State had a special national structure, but its conditions are to change decisively. A number of causes of dispute with our neighbours will disappear. We shall form a national State of Czechs and Slovaks, on lines indicated by the principle of nationality, and this will give great strength to our whole people—a new creative force and a strong moral basis such as it did not till now possess. We are still strong and numerous enough. Let us look hopefully to our national future.

Thanks to their origin and whole education for generations past the Czechs and Slovaks are far from being a nation that lives by catastrophes. We are a typically sober people, and just as in our good fortune we were too confident, we shall not in misfortune lose our heads. The heroism of work and self-sacrifice, which now awaits us, is not less worthy than heroism on the battlefield.

The tree top of our home has been lopped off, but the roots of our people go deep into the soil. Let us return to those roots, and put into them all our forces, as we have often done in past history. The topmost branches will after a time put forth new shoots. Let us bear in mind that what remains to us after every sacrifice as the kernel of our home, as the heritage which we must preserve to future generations, is still a possession of eternal worth, and that our State will even now not remain as one of the smallest, but possessing a culture equal to that of greater nations.

Finally I direct to you this appeal from my heart. The home of the Czechs and Slovaks is really in danger and would be in still greater danger if we did not all hold together in concord and unity and in full moral force. Above all there must be unity with the Slovaks: they too are in danger. Today it is not a matter of this or that concession. We must concede mutually wherever this is necessary.

I appeal to all sections of the population, to the country folk, the workmen, the middle class, the intelligentsia. Keep calm and united, show love to one another: for as Masaryk used to say, home, state, people are all who stand upon your native soil. Lay aside for a time all quarrels and petty interests and concentrate your efforts upon common work. Above all I thank our splendid army; I devoted to it all my time as President, and shall never forget it. I believe in its future.

I close with the expression of my deep faith in the eternal strength and endurance of our people, in its energy, toughness and endurance, and above all in its devotion to the ideals of humanity, freedom, right and justice, for which it has so often fought and suffered and with which it has always conquered in the end. I too fought for them and shall remain true to them. I shall not leave the ship in the storm. But I believe that such a sacrifice is necessary, though it does not mean that I could forget my duty to work on as citizen and patriot. I wish to all, to the Republic, to the nation, better days: may it live, grow and flourish as a noble member of the human family and one of the noblest of European peoples.

## TWENTY YEARS OF CZECH LITERATURE (1918-1938)<sup>1</sup>

THE events of the last few months have made a sharp break in the political life of Czechoslovakia. No particular gift of prophecy is needed to foresee that the political upheaval will have the most far-reaching social and moral consequences. Necessarily, also, literature will change profoundly, though it would be presumption to predict the exact direction of its new course. We can, at least, be sure that an era has come to an end. These twenty years of Czech literature represent, then, not merely a chronological section but a definite and unified period. But we are still much too near these twenty years to be able to see them in perspective as one whole. Such a detachment is not yet possible. We can sort out only a few main tendencies and personalities which stand out to the contemporary observer.

When, after the war, Czechoslovakia emerged as an independent country, literature had to be reconstituted just as much as every other cultural or political activity. The war years under Austrian domination, which meant a very rigid censorship, complete isolation from the Western world, and, in some prominent cases (Machar, Dyk, Bezruč), even actual persecution of writers, were a *cæsura* in literature as well as in politics. It was a time of an almost underground existence: some of the great writers continued to create in virtual isolation, but the general public turned to the reading of patriotic historical novels and poetry, from which they drew faith in the greatness and ultimate resurrection of the nation.

At the end of the war the atmosphere changed radically. The dogged determination of the war years was replaced by the almost

<sup>1</sup> *Bibliographical Note*: No attempt has been made to include Slovak literature, which could not have been treated adequately in this sketch. In French there is a good informative sketch of recent Czech literature by Hanuš Jelínek, *Histoire de la Littérature Tschèque de 1890 à nos jours*, Paris, 1935, and in German there is a masterly survey by Arne Novák in O. Walzel's *Handbuch der Literaturwissenschaft*, Potsdam, 1932. In Czech the main books are by Arne Novák (especially the new edition of his *Dějiny literatury české*, just being published in instalments), B. Václavek, *Česká literatura XX. století*, 1935, K. Polák, *Československá literatura 1890-1935* (1936). Numerous collections of essays by F. Götz, A. M. Píša, B. Václavek, A. Vyskočil, and a series of little monographs *Postavy a díla* (ed. by J. Hora), should be consulted.

miraculous fulfilment of a centuries-old dream. A stream of self-confidence and buoyant optimism flooded the country. The former frequently cramped nationalism of a nation fighting for its very existence was, with the temporary removal of external danger, replaced by enthusiastic hopes in a new and juster society. Though the social question could never have been entirely absent from the mind of a people whose national struggle has necessarily been also a social conflict, it came to the fore in literature only after the war, when everywhere inside and around Czechoslovakia great social changes were taking place. All of a sudden, the pre-war writers exclusively interested in the adventures of their own souls lost their following. Social questions, feelings common to the masses of mankind, became the central topic of most writers, including the most lyrical poets. Subjectivism, individualism, anything that savoured of "decadence" was swept away in a great flood of communal experience. The old intellectualism disappeared, and man—at least as far as he was represented in literature—emerged rather as a social animal than as a spiritual being. With a joy which it is difficult not to describe as sometimes naive and even childish, many writers embraced a gospel of life in opposition to spirit and mind. Escaped as they just were from the prison of the war years, they glorified the simple pleasures of mere existence, the sensations and feelings common to all, the beauty of the simplest and nearest things.

This change of outlook had, of course, its social reasons. Czech literature expanded considerably in the size of production: the reading public increased by leaps and bounds, not only because Czech had again become a language read in Slovakia and by the reclaimed Czech minorities, but even more so as education spread a hunger for literature to wider and "lower" classes. The increase in the number of newspapers and (frequently short-lived) periodicals was startling: it went in company with a State-supported expansion of public libraries and a higher purchasing power of the reading classes. This great quantitative increase fostered a higher financial reward for writing, and this in turn stimulated the influx of new writers into journalism, translating and "higher" literature. This expansion, in accordance with the social changes, necessarily meant democratisation. This democratisation is obvious also in the changes transforming the language of literature. The old ornate or declamatory style is gone irrevocably. It became, apparently, almost incomprehensible to the majority of readers, who encouraged the new writers to use the language of everyday life, of journalism or

slang, or to experiment with words and phrases in defiance of all established rules. These changes meant a marked break with the pre-war tradition of Czech literature. Whole genres which were then extremely popular, like the historical romance or the village novel, disappeared almost entirely. The wider reading public ignored almost completely, even the greatest pre-war writers such as Vrchlický, as could be shown from their sales and the break down of their publishers. Only slowly the younger writers again established contact with the national tradition, but in harmony with their own predilections they resuscitated elements like the simple folk-song and the line of poets inspired by it (such as K. J. Erben) in preference to other national traditions which seemed more removed from the spirit of the people. This break in the spiritual tradition is also clearly shown in the changes of artistic forms and techniques: the free verse and the simple song replaced the rhetorical renaissance tradition in poetry, the loose chronicle of events and impressions, or the framework of the crime or detective novel ousted the old psychological novel with a central hero, and dramatised novels, with little or no conflict, scored surprising successes on the stage.

This general weakening of the home tradition was also favoured by the enormous influx of translations, largely from the Western literatures, which had become natural and useful in reaction to the isolation of the war years and as an expression of political sympathies with the West. France, which had had a great importance for the development of Czech literature since the 'seventies of the last century, resumed her ascendancy. Lyrical poetry especially followed many of the Paris fashions up to "surréalisme," and the influence of writers like Jules Romains, Apollinaire, Carco, Cocteau, etc., could frequently be traced quite clearly. England and America, however, comparatively increased their influence much more extensively. The actual literary influence of the French was possibly greater, while the masses of the reading public enjoyed the English novels. But significant English influences are discernible in writers like Čapek and could be traced elsewhere. It would take pages to enumerate the titles of the main English books translated since the war: they include all authors of any standing and many of no standing at all. They range from crime novels to translations of James Joyce, A. Huxley, D. H. Lawrence, J. Conrad and V. Woolf. German literature, compared to the Western literatures, receded into the background, though, at least temporarily, some writers born in Prague (like Werfel, Kafka and Rilke) were influential, and the theatre learned a good deal from the post-war Berlin stage. The

contacts with the other Slavonic literatures were in Czechoslovakia necessarily always more intimate than in any other Western country. But Polish and Jugoslav literature remained largely the interest of scholars, while only Russian commanded any popular appeal. A section of the public showed a strong interest in the new Soviet literature, mostly because of common political sympathies, and one can trace the influence of several poets (Blok, Esenin) and recently of novelists (Sholokhov) in Czech literature, though it seems that the literary affinities were, on the whole, smaller than a common attitude to the social function of literature.

Czechoslovakia after the war, more than ever, stood at the crossroads of all cultural influences, in consequence of her geographical position, her Slavonic language and her Western sympathies. The cross currents were and are so numerous and even contradictory that this general sketch of the literary atmosphere just after the war must be understood *cum grano salis*. There were soon exceptions and movements of opposition. It was never possible to fetter some great individualists, and soon the new advent of literary Catholicism and a new village novel changed or modified the democratic and socialist outlook prevalent before. The atmosphere changed even more when the clouds of the approaching political storm were seen to be gathering. The early rather facile optimism became an exception. Besides, even in the early stages of the post-war development the break with the past, of course, could not be absolute.

No account of the Czech achievement in the field of literature after the war can ignore the older writers, who continued writing and sometimes even produced their best work only after the war. J. S. Machar (born in 1864), who before the war was the most influential Czech poet, published further volumes of his poetical survey of human history and wrote several books of memoirs and epigrams. But his sharp personal opposition to President Masaryk and a general distaste for his pagan individualism, inspired by Nietzsche, condemned him to isolation. It would be difficult to trace his influence on any prominent member of the younger generations. Antonín Sova (1864-1928), the most sensitive and delicate of Czech poets, a dreamer who still had a warm heart for his nation and the cause of social justice, was little heeded either, though his new books were scarcely on a lower level than his finest pre-war work. Viktor Dyk (1877-1931) also remained without important followers: his epigrammatical, rationalistic style and his conservative nationalism did not appeal to a new anti-intellectualist generation out for social nivellisation. Also, the refined poetical work of Otokar



*Fischer* (1883-1938), successful as he was as an excellent translator of verse and as literary historian, was too individualist, too overburdened with the personal problems of a highly cultivated Czech Jew, to influence a new generation absorbed in different problems. Of the older poets only S. K. Neumann (born in 1875) became the patron of the young Socialist poets after the war. His flamboyant free verse, welcoming the Russian revolution and praising the beauty of modern technical civilisation, appealed to the new time, though he never equalled his pre-war hymns in praise of anarchic love and woods, waters and hillsides inhabited by Pan and his nymphs.

Among the older novelists, *Josef Holeček* (1853-1929) continued to work at his monumental series of studies on the Southern Bohemian peasants. But the later volumes of the series, entitled *Our People*, which continue a crowded picture of country life, peasant customs and social conflicts comparable to Reymont's *Chłopi*, have not the vitality of his early work. *Karel Matěj Čapek-Chod* (1860-1927), who should not be confused with his younger namesake, was more fortunate. His rather heavy-handed and frequently sensational and even brutal naturalism gained considerable recognition after the war. His new books, a war novel and the story of a sculptor, showed unabated vigour and gusto, though the underlying view of life was that of a cynical and melancholy materialism. Also *A. M. Tilschová* (born in 1873), an excellent chronicler of the decaying Prague bourgeoisie and a fine analytical novelist in the older tradition, increased her early successes by excursions into the novel of social conflicts among miners (*The Pit Heaps*, 1927) and a vigorous picture of the Medical Faculty of Prague University (*Alma Mater*, 1934). Another distinguished woman-writer, *Božena Benešová* (1873-1936) had a considerable *succès d'estime* with her new very ambitious books. A trilogy of novels depicts Moravia during the war with an ethical sincerity and a psychological penetration which is altogether honourable. But her frequently precious style, diffuse composition and a certain undeniable coldness have prevented a wider appeal of a sincere and even sometimes profound writer. Only, it seems, *Fráňa Šrámek* (born in 1877) could hold the attention of a younger generation by his impressionist novels centering round the problem of puberty and glorifying sexual love with a lyrical tenderness and sensitive sensuality whose charm it is difficult to gainsay. *The Body* (1919) is a book almost symbolic for the mood of the earliest post-war years.

But of all the writers with roots in the pre-war period, two stood out as the embodiments of the spiritual aspirations of their nation, though both did not belong to *belles-lettres* in the more narrow sense. *T. G. Masaryk* (1850-1937) was not only the great political leader of his nation, but a thinker and critic of society and literature in his own right. Few books were more widely read than his account of his war years (*The Making of the State*, 1925) or the charmingly human conversations which Karel Čapek has put down with scrupulous fidelity. But Masaryk's direct influence on literature could not be far-reaching, as his innate puritanism prevented him from approaching literature as an art.

In many ways his antipode, *F. X. Šalda* (1867-1937) was primarily a critic of literature. Šalda's influence, great even before the war, increased astonishingly, especially since he published a review filled entirely with his own comments on literature, life and politics. After the war he encouraged and took under his wing all the newest movements and youngest adepts of literature. His artistic ideals came more and more to include moral and social ideas and to justify a philosophy of civilisation radically antagonistic to the humane democratism of Masaryk. Šalda has fixed the values of most of the older Czech poets, has introduced much Western (especially French) literature and has analysed many figures and movements in the whole of Europe from Romanticism to "surréalisme" with a psychological insight and powerful judgment most unusual in any literature. But on the debit side one must mention his frequently uncritical support for youthful extravaganzas and his indulgence in fierce polemics which have embittered the tone of all Czech criticism.

Next to Šalda, *Arne Novák* (born in 1880) has judged and surveyed the whole course of Czech literature from a point of view much more conservative and traditionalist, which has not, however, distorted his critical enjoyment of all kinds of literature. His several histories of Czech literature and his numerous books of essays, though sometimes too ornate in style, are models of erudition, fine taste and good judgment.

All these writers had grown up in pre-war years: their artistic technique or creed was based on the traditions of realism, impressionism or symbolism prevalent before the war. This solid European tradition, essentially descended from Romanticism, was broken only by the younger generation which either had just started to write before the war or matured only after it. Lyrical

poetry was always the centre of Czech literature, as the novel or the drama were of more recent growth, for obvious social reasons.

Czech poetry, after the war, went through three fairly clearly marked stages which can be labelled as "proletarian" poetry, "poetism," and a return to spiritualism which has been felt only during the last few years. First, a new social radicalism, an optimistic faith in the approach of a new kingdom of heaven on earth, was the keynote of the young poets. Most of these proletarian poets—not all of them of proletarian descent—who sang the praises of the workman and the approach of his liberation, embraced communism as fervently as young people can believe in a remote ideal. Their communism was rather an anticipation of a curiously idyllic earthly paradise than anything typically Russian. Russian was only the belief in the absolute subservience of the individual to the movement, of art to its social aim, of technique to popular appeal. The most prominent poet of the movement was *Jiří Wolker* (1900-1924), whose early death made him even more than during his life the symbol of this young generation. His social ballads, his attempts to express the soul of the crowd, his poems of approaching death, remain the finest achievement of this "proletarian" stage of Czech poetry, in spite of an inevitable naïveté and a very youthful sentimentality. His poetical technique is still rather traditional: it preserves a lucid simplicity, not far removed from that of the folk-song and ballad. It frequently preserves traditional stanza forms and rhyme schemes. Only an older poet, *Josef Hora* (born in 1891), broke through to a new modernist style which ignores the traditional logical sentence structure and clear metaphor. After paying his debt to "proletarian" literature, he found a way to a new style of melancholy meditation on time and the universe which links him again with the great romantic tradition. In recent years his social mysticism has found its way to a new nationalism, a sign that Hora more than any of his contemporaries is capable of change and growth.

But in the meantime the general enthusiasm for "proletarian" poetry had evaporated. As early as in 1924, when social conditions seemed to be stabilised and a period of peace and prosperity in store, arose a "poetism" which disclaimed any desire to reform the world. Poetism was a new name for "pure poetry," for poetry devoid of thought and propaganda, for poetry as a play of fancy and association. *Vítězslav Nezval* (born in 1900), who is its main protagonist, is an astonishing virtuoso in poetical fireworks: a painter of little colourful pictures, an inventor of fantastic rhymes,

illogical associations, grotesque fancies, whole topsy-turvy worlds. The affinities with futurism or Apollinaire are frequently obvious; and recently, under the impression of French "surréalisme," he has wholeheartedly accepted a creed which stresses the unconscious, and the poetical value of the most irresponsible dream. The playful charm of Nezval's talent should not, however, conceal a certain vulgarity and bad taste which is most apparent in his fantastic novels. "Poetism" in Czechoslovakia seems less the refinement of an over-subtle society than the plaything of rather crude young men without intellectual ideas or traditions.

The inevitable reaction to poetism came with the general darkening of the international and national horizon. We see it in melancholy poets who still use the poetistic technique, as in *František Halas* (born in 1901) and especially in *Jan Zahradníček* (born in 1905), who obviously is inspired by the great master of Czech symbolism, Otakar Březina. In Zahradníček we find a new spirituality, largely based on the Catholic creed, a new very abstract style and a hymnical rhythm quite different from the little splashes of colour and comic ditties of Nezval. Here are the germs of a new development of Czech poetry whose fruits it is impossible to predict. The exclusive Parisian modernism seems dead. Significantly enough, even a poetist of the purest water like *Jaroslav Seifert* (born in 1901), who had outdone Nezval in poetic jugglery, has had the heart and mind to write a series of very fine and even refined poems on the death of Thomas Masaryk.

It would be much less easy to distinguish clear stages in the development of the Czech post-war novel. The traditional framework of the novel also stood the test of new matter much better. Certain tendencies of the novel agree with the general trend of literature away from individualism. The old psychological novel disappeared almost completely, and when it reappeared it was transformed out of recognition to a novel using psycho-analysis, stressing the unconscious and subconscious in man, the elements which have least to do with mind and moral choice. The old form of narrative, with its clear chain of events, was largely discarded in favour of forms which tried to include a slice of life, a multitude of events and figures in a whole which frequently could not but be loose and rather formless. Experiments increased in number, and a flood of new topics streamed into the novel: a whole sociology of post-war Czechoslovakia could be reconstructed from its novel; every section of the population and almost every district is represented in fiction. The whole scale of social classes and the whole

gamut of feelings has been covered. In the increasing flood it is difficult to discern the names which will stand out also in the future, as the level of technique has in general been high, and the deafening din of commercialised criticism makes a proper sifting difficult. But a few groups and main figures may be discussed.

The social novel was necessarily in the forefront. There are hundreds of attempts to depict the social changes of contemporary society in broad and wide surveys which cover either all classes or some particular section of the country. *Marie Majerová* (born in 1882) is such a specialist in industrial problems, an ardent socialist and still a lover of nature. Her novel *The Siren* is an attempt to depict the social history of a particular region, which changes from agriculture to coal-mining, and in another novel, *The Dam*, she has tried to give a picture of the coming proletarian revolution which is not only vivid but also amusing in its rather simplistic optimism. Her distribution of light and shade is sometimes rather crude, but she has a certain freshness and vitality which is missing in some of the more self-conscious sociological novelists. *Marie Pujmanová* (born in 1893) is a more sophisticated novelist with a more individual style. Her book *People at the Crossroads* has been rightly praised as an excellent survey of post-war Czechoslovakia, its industrial, social and moral problems. Both these women writers escape the old individualistic novel and try to give almost documentary pictures from social conflicts, largely in the towns.

The country has again become a topic of the novel, written in quite a different spirit from the old-time folklorist idylls. The new "ruralists" (as they call themselves) have done much for a clearer understanding of the peasant and his social struggles with industrialisation and urbanisation. The leader of the group is *J. Knap*, who has also given theoretical expression to these views and has written several novels which describe the fate of peasants uprooted from their soil. *The Stranger*, for instance, tells the story of a peasant who has moved from the plain to the mountains, and cannot become acclimatised. The best artist among the group is *František Křelina*, whose novels give a vivid picture of the countryside during the depression and show a genuine love of the soil and nature, with rare powers of presentation. Also *Jan Čep* (born in 1902) is related to this group and treats topics at first sight similar to those of the ruralists. *The Boundary of the Shadow* shows a youth returning home to the country and slowly regaining his spiritual integrity under the healing influence of nature. But in Čep there is a genuine

religious feeling which is missing in the others, a mystical desire for salvation, a subtler style of rare spiritual beauty. Čep has no social axe to grind, but struggles for an inner harmony against a deep and tragic melancholy. He is a conscientious artist, at his best in small sketches, of whom more should be heard in the future.

One of the obvious topics of the novel was also the Great War, and, again, it was difficult to write a war novel purely from the individualist point of view. Most of the writers quite consciously tried to describe the soul of the mass, a group of soldiers, a platoon, or to write almost a historical chronicle. *Jaroslav Hašek* (1883-1923) has given a grotesque picture of the Austrian Empire in dissolution in his *Good Soldier Švejk*. The book is not much of a work of art, as it is full of low humour and cheap propaganda; but the type of the foolish, smiling, cowardly Czech Sancho Panza who goes unscathed through the military machine of the Empire is difficult to forget, however unheroic and uninspiring he may be. The great adventure of the Czechoslovak legions in Russia and Siberia obviously lent itself to different treatment. *Rudolf Medek* (born in 1890) has written a series of novels, based on his own experiences, in a genuine heroic spirit, while *Josef Kopta* (born in 1894) has in his *Third Platoon* rather stressed the social problems, in a kindly, quiet way which makes a human appeal that is missing in either the heroic Medek or the cynical Hašek. Besides these groups there are many specialist novelists who cover all kinds of topics; for instance, *Zdeněk Němeček* devoted himself to novels from the Czech emigration in America or France; *Egon Hostovský* is a specialist in the Jewish problem and has written novels of horror and crime; *Emil Vachek* has a good humorous novel to his credit, though he also solved tragic problems of crime and punishment.

The general level of technique, ease of presentation and obvious knowledge of the subject is high. But four authors seem to stand out most conspicuously as personalities with a clearly discernible development and a highly individual style. To them many of the generalisations made above do not apply: they are in many ways the great exceptions just because of their individuality and their consciousness of difference.

*Ivan Olbracht* (pseudonym for Kamil Zeman, born in 1882) is, in spite of his Communist sympathies, nearest to the old tradition. *The Strange Friendship of the Actor Jesenius* (1919) is a psychological novel from theatrical life, which shows great penetration and an art of composition rare at this time. Later Olbracht specialised in stories from Sub-Carpathian Russia, the primitive region which had

joined Czechoslovakia after the war. *Robber Nikola Šuhaj* (1933) is Olbracht's freshest book. His vivid picture of the country's deep forests, of its mixed population and the conflicts between Jews, Ruthenians and Czechs, has an epic power, almost Homeric in grandeur and pristine vigour. Olbracht is in his heart of hearts a romanticist who wants to overcome the limitations of romantic egoism by social co-operation, by the warmth of personal friendship, and by love. His realistic, quiet style (one of the best in modern Czech prose) is frequently shot through by lyrical poetry. None of his other books can compare with *Nikolaj Šuhaj*, though some of his stories and sketches from Sub-Carpathian Russia (like those in *Golet in the Valley*) are noteworthy.

It is difficult to imagine a greater contrast than that between Olbracht and *Jaroslav Durych* (born in 1886). Durych is a Roman Catholic in his philosophy, and he has, almost single-handed, revived the Czech historical novel. In his three volumes on Wallenstein, *The Erring Quest* (1929, in the English translation called quite inappropriately "The Descent of the Idol"), an attempt is made to paint a large scale fresco of the Thirty Years War from the Battle of the White Mountain to the murder of Wallenstein. But Durych's historical novel has little to do with the tradition descending from Walter Scott. It is not so much the fact that Durych conceives Czech history in terms hostile to Protestantism and enters with sympathy into the spirit of the Catholic Counter-Reformation which distinguishes him from the older Czech historical novelist. He actually attempts also to express the spirit of that age by a successful imitation of baroque forms and styles, and he fills his novel with ideas utterly foreign to the early antiquarian and patriotic novel. Durych is preoccupied with the religious problem. Wallenstein remains in the background as a shadow, and the story centres round two star-crossed lovers, the Czech heretic George and the Spanish Catholic girl Angeline. A strange conflict of death and love, cruelty and lust, brutality and ecstasy, permeates the book, which frequently loses all touch with ordinary reality and becomes a dream-vision of haunting and sometimes puzzling beauty. Durych's other, less-successful books, placed sometimes in the present time, which he hates with the loathing of a medieval mind for a godless age, frequently repeat the theme of a quest for one predestined woman or celebrate poverty and virginity. Sometimes they decay into merely decorative and vaguely allegorical compositions which do not altogether hide their descent from the Catholic decadence. Durych, however, is a powerful artist, though quite out of tune

with his time, isolated in modern Czech literature, in general revolt against all modern civilisation.

Compared to him, *Karel Čapek* (born in 1890) seems in complete harmony with his age, though he has criticised the evils of modern civilisation in several, one might say, almost anti-Utopian utopias. As I have discussed his varied career in a former number of this *Review*<sup>2</sup>, only a few main points need be repeated in this context. Čapek's best work is the trilogy of novels *Hordubal*, *The Meteor* and *An Ordinary Life*. Each of these novels tries to tell the same story from a different point of view in order to enhance the variety of its meaning and to suggest the utter mysteriousness of ultimate reality. *Hordubal* on the surface is a story of crime from the Carpathian mountains, *The Meteor* is made up of speculative reconstructions of the early history of a pilot who has come down in a crash, *An Ordinary Life* is a novel of the Czech bourgeois, the story of a railway clerk who discovers unexpected hidden selves in his own mind and past. But these books all centre round problems of truth and reality and constitute one of the most successful attempts at a philosophical novel, not only in Czech. But Čapek does not owe his success to his finest books. many readers will prefer his Utopian romances like the *Absolute at Large* or *Krakatit*, his many original crime stories and the charming sketches and travel books. Since my article appeared, Karel Čapek has published another travel book, this time on Scandinavia, and a short novel, *The First Rescue Party* (1937), taken from the life of miners, which is full of Čapek's social feeling and his real understanding of the common man. Čapek has been frequently called by Czech criticism too international, which is possibly true of some of his Utopian romances and plays. But a book like *An Ordinary Life* is a finely drawn picture of the Czech atmosphere, and there is something very representative and national in Čapek's love of the small man, in his genuine democratism and humanism.

Of quite a different mental type is *Vladislav Vančura* (born in 1891), who has nothing of Čapek's idyllism, optimism and humanism. Vančura is a most versatile author, his books seem sometimes to have nothing in common except for the mastery of language; but if any view of the world can be abstracted from them, it is a complete nihilism. Vančura, especially in his early books, glories in the merely animal, the repulsive, the grotesque. The world appears as a madhouse of suffering and brutality. His "heroes" are almost

<sup>2</sup> Vol. XV, No. 43, pp. 191-206.



always weak-minded, kind-hearted saints or brutal animal men of force. *The Baker Marhoul* (1924) is an apotheosis of the blessed fool who is duped and exploited until his death. The single escape from the bestiality of life and fellow-men is in work, the only hope for the future in the proletarian. *Fields of Work and War* (1925) is a war-novel, a terrible picture of brutality, free of idiots, drunkards and maniacs. In his later novels Vančura has experimented with all sorts of forms and topics. *Markéta Lazarová* (1931) is a happy-go-lucky romance of robbers and knights set in an uncertain dim past, full of passion and lust, *The Flight to Budapest* (1932) a normal social novel contrasting a primitive Slovak with a Czech girl, etc. Vančura is an experimenter almost at any cost, a supreme master of language, which he treats and often maltreats in defiance of all rules and traditions. He purposely discards all attempts at illusion in the novel—he freely comments on his inventions, and his figures speak without any attempt at a realistic imitation of their actual speech. Vančura is less of a moralist or philosopher than most Czech novelists. He seems outside the time in his indifference to contemporary problems—but he is in his own way representative of the post-war generation which denies all spiritual values and all accepted order and breaks away from all established traditions of art.

On the whole, the Czech novel after the war presents an astonishingly varied and vivid picture of social reality, and its best artists have succeeded in creating a number of really original works of art—these are sometimes over-subtle, and even eccentric, just at their artistic best. The reason may be that, in spite of the passionate desire for collectivism, actually most writers write, as almost everywhere else in the world, in virtual isolation from their public.

The exclusiveness and isolation of modern literature is also exemplified in the drama, which nowhere in recent times has succeeded in becoming a national art. The Czech theatre after the war would require special prolonged study to justify this sense of disappointment. An explanation would have to take account of theatrical history, and less of the drama as mere literature. Looked at from this more narrow point of view—in spite of all the excellent stagecraft of the Prague theatres—the home production seems curiously anæmic. The poetical drama, in spite of many ambitious attempts and even individual beauties, has failed as everywhere else. Only *František Langer* (born in 1882) scored some lasting successes with well-constructed, though hardly profound, comedies and dramas from the small bourgeoisie or the periphery of Prague, and there are,

of course, the brothers Čapek, whose two plays *R.U.R.* and *The Insect Play* went the round of the world's stages. Though both these plays treat topical problems most successfully, they seem frequently mechanical, devoid of dramatic conflict, and certainly compare unfavourably with the finer work of these authors in narrative and essayistic prose. Much amusing, clever and even deeply interesting work has been done by younger writers, and possibly something more lasting may come out of it ultimately. But one has the impression that the drama has become a rare plant and that, for reasons sometimes rather obscure, it lags behind the poetry or the novel even in its power to represent the period.

No forecast of the future can be attempted under the present fluid conditions. But a retrospect must point out the profusion of Czech post-war literature, the artistic success of some of the great authors and the urgency of the central problem of any small literature: the problem of its individuality and nationality. Possibly the post-war years with their social changes have gone too far in the incorporation of Czech literature in the general Western tradition, and complaints, partly justified, have been made against this cosmopolitanism. But if we look more closely we shall see that, on the basis of social conditions necessarily more equal to those of the West than ever before, a genuine attempt has been made to express something individual and peculiarly Czech. Inside the Western literary tradition Czech literature has preserved and reasserted a very distinct character of its own.

RENÉ WELLEK.

## POLAND'S DEFENCES

POLAND lies between the East and the West; which means, on the great crossways of storms and historical conflicts. Apart from the Carpathians on the south and the Prypiet Fenlands in the centre of the Eastern border, she has no natural frontiers at all. The rivers that run parallel with the state boundaries, flow into the heart of the land. The Niemen and the Bug from the east, the Narew and the Bug from the north, and the Notec and the Warta on the north-west and the west. The most important river is of course the Vistula, the axis of the state. When things get as far as a battle on the Vistula, the very existence of Poland is at stake, and the battle fought here by our armies in 1920 decided also the fate of Central Europe.

The Polish Republic represents an armed camp, with its base in the Carpathians, and spread out over the broad and unprotected Sarmatian plain. Its most effectual defence has always been and is still today its people. Hence, the knightly tradition of the past. Hence, too, the element of heroism that marks the stages of Polish history. In this same fact lies also the element of tragedy connected with that past. The Tartar migrations coming from the east during the Middle Ages, were broken on the muster of Polish Knighthood. At that time the country was the outpost of western Europe, a sort of first line of defence. To-day, too, she is a line of defence against Soviet Russia, in case that power should attempt to force Bolshevism on western Europe.

The Polish army of our time is the heir of the fine tradition of those knights of other ages. These were maintained during generations of political subjection by the men who fought to regain their liberties; and they have been handed on to the now restored commonwealth. As an expression of them we had the Legions, at whose head Pilsudski marched out from Cracow to do battle with the Tsar's armies, when the Great War began in 1914. These were joined later by the army formed of American Poles in France, by Paderewski and others, and fighting there under the control of the Polish National Committee, with Roman Dmowski as its chairman.

. At the head of these troops stood General Joseph Haller, who had gone over to the Allies on 15 February, 1918, with his armed force of Poles occupying a sector of the Austrian front against Russia. This was done by way of protest against the Treaty of Brest Litowsk, forced by the Central Powers on Soviet Russia: a

treaty that proposed another partition of Poland. Legionary formations, operating in part secretly, in part openly, in Poland at the time of her liberation, together with Polish units saved from the armies of the three Empires (among them the Corps of General Dowbor-Muśnicki, composed of one-time members of the Tsar's forces), were then joined in April, 1919, by the Haller Army from France. Thus was made up the first nucleus of the Polish Army. Its form and its spirit were welded in the heat of battle. The struggle had begun on 11th November, 1918, on three fronts, against the Bolshevik armies, against the Ukrainian troops in South-eastern Poland, and against the Germans in the West. By its courage at that time the nation broke its fetters of subjection, and recovered its lawful territories, anticipating in certain respects the later decisions of Versailles. Struggles such as these were bound to be a great hindrance to the normal organisation of any army. Nevertheless, the force did find itself quickly, rising as a Phoenix from ashes in an atmosphere of universal enthusiasm, under the leadership of the first Chief of the State—Joseph Pilsudski. This army was the first achievement of the restored Poland.

Such experiences gave it a special and unusual character. It was an army that did not break with the past. It fosters today with care the best traditions of other days, preserving with special piety the cherished heritage of the struggle for independence in which it was born. At the same time it is a power, equipped in wholly modern fashion. As a model it has taken faithfully the armies of France, which showed on the Marne and at Verdun their eminent qualities in a war of movement, such as Poland especially needs, as well as an unequalled power of endurance when sheer defence is needed.

\* \* \* \* \*

The Polish Republic lies at the very centre of Europe. As neighbour on the east it has the Soviet Union, on the West the new Greater Germany. Part of this latter, namely East Prussia—a German colony from medieval days, lies right to the north of Poland's capital, Warsaw, and is cut off from the Empire proper by the solidly Polish province of Pomerania. The other neighbours are, to the south Czechoslovakia and Roumania, to the north Lithuania and Latvia. With none of these neighbours does Poland wish a quarrel. Our one desire is for peace. Nevertheless the past has clearly taught us that the intentions of Germany and even of Soviet Russia do not permit of a complete sense of safety. Just the reverse. As a result watchfulness and a strong defensive army, which can

do its duty when necessary, are more needful for Poland than for any other nation in Europe.

In case of armed conflict we should be fighting either on the German or on the Russian front. The danger of war both with Germany and the Soviets which threatened Poland at the time of the Rapallo agreement in 1923, seems for the moment to be past. Whether for ever no one can say. Such things depend on political considerations, and these are always in a state of change.

A Russian problem does not exist for us today. In its place we have the menace of Bolshevism, which is universal in character. For that reason, Poland ought not to be abandoned in case of war with the Soviets. The nation, however, cannot forget the fact that in the terrible days of 1920, which recalled for it the Russian invasions of other times, a Polish Bolshevik government was in office in Wyszki near Warsaw, with two Poles, Marchlewski and Dzierzynski, in charge. They are reminded of all this by the present Russian Constitution—the third since 1918, which says that the Red Army of workers and peasants may receive orders at any time to take up arms in defence of the international proletariat.

There is a fundamental difference in the way that Poland looks at the two problems—the Soviet and the German one. The Versailles Treaty, which is the chief source of Poland's restoration, determined for her the return of the provinces at one time seized and held by Prussia. The Germans have not as yet reconciled themselves to the definite and final loss of these provinces. The Weimar Republic kept pressing its claims constantly for the almost solidly Polish Pomerania. After January, 1934, when the well-known pact of non-aggression was made with Adolf Hitler, these claims were silenced. That is the gain resulting from the understanding of that date. Nevertheless schemings have not ceased, whose aim it is to take from us our western provinces. Nor have the anti-Polish sentiments of Germans died out. We can see this from what is going on in Danzig. Propaganda continues to declare that a conquering nation like the German has not given up its imperialistic plans, but so far as Poland is concerned has only postponed them to a more convenient season. We have seen how these plans are being realized to a terrifying degree in Central Europe. The smashing of the gallant and unhappy Czechoslovak Republic is alas, an eloquent incident in this story. The Germans revert constantly to force as an argument for the justifying of their

demands They keep doing it each time in a more brutal form, holding Europe under pressure, and openly threatening violence in case their demands are not met. Poland, as their nearest neighbour, must reckon with this danger, which mounts in proportion as the power of the Third Reich increases. We are reminded of this by the well-known and official exponent of the theory of National Socialism, Alfred Rosenberg, who preaches, in addition to the partition of Russia, the destruction of Poland The Germans need land in order to survive They have not, it is clear, reconciled themselves finally with the loss of their Polish provinces, and apart from controlling Central Europe, they are aiming at the creation of a great Ukraine as a colony of their own.

The worst threat to Poland in the past was that of an understanding between the Germans and the Russians. For that reason, the maintenance of a state of things in which Poland would not be faced by an alliance of Berlin and Moscow, is for us a vital interest Does this lie in our power as it did, at times, long ago?

In reflecting on this question, we should remember that there exist in the Third Reich influential military circles which have not rejected the idea of a return to friendship with Soviet Russia. Such a policy was favoured by von Seeckt It has not been uncongenial to Marshal von Blomberg, and even General von Fritsch has professed it. What is more, the present Chief of the General Staff, Keitel, was Chief of the Military Mission which worked for a time with the Red Army. Strategic considerations draw toward this arrangement, in a Germany that is without colonies. Russian raw materials are vitally needed by German industry. They would also help to make possible the complete motorisation of the country, as well as of the mechanised armies that are at the moment too large to handle.

Looking at this whole matter from the point of view of military planning, we might ask for certain guarantees, proceed to a revision of our views, and for the future, consider a certain measure of agreement with Soviet Russia which would guarantee us benevolent neutrality on our Eastern borders. Under no conditions, however, could we agree to admit Bolshevik armies on to Polish territory. But this kind of neutrality would still demand the insuring of our frontiers toward Russia in case of war. We should still have to keep in mind this second front. Expectations like this, and plans based on them, could easily be altered, if and when the actual situation showed itself less threatening. In view of all this the possibility that Poland, because of her geographical position, must

be prepared to meet two opponents, is the most pertinent guide to be followed when military preparations are being considered.

\* \* \* \*

Can Poland concede to one of these neighbours more significance than to the other? Is she, for example, in the situation of Jugoslavia, which has on the one side Hungary, on the other Italy, the second of them being decidedly stronger than the first? Such a state of things would be highly desirable. In that event, and if war should arise, it would suffice to leave a frontier guard on one line, while all mobilised forces could be directed to the battle area. As things are at present with Poland, the caution that is necessary in all matters pertaining to national defence, compels us to reject this tempting prospect.

In reality, apart from exceptions that are well known, Soviet Russia has at her disposal an army very powerful numerically. The mobilisation and concentration of this army is nevertheless, even today, a thing that demands time. Its provisioning in all respects will still be uneven and inadequate. In the same way the training of the recruits and their morale must be somewhat fore-shortened as a result of the terror that has been exercised towards their leaders, and of the general interference by the politicians. In any case the Soviet air-force is a powerful one, and it can operate effectively against Poland from the moment that hostilities begin. Should war be prolonged the Moscow government can assemble and put into the field immense forces. Taking advantage of the boundless territory of the Union, which is an effective shelter even with the present day air strength, it could take the offensive in any direction it might choose.

Poland's frontier toward Russia is a long one—just over 1,400 km. Apart from the distance across the Prypiet Fenlands, amounting to some 300 km., it is an open and movable line. This enormous spread of our eastern frontier becomes a serious matter for us, when we consider the forces by which it may be invested. Between the two powers involved exists a grave disproportion. We must also realise that our eastern frontier is several hundred km. distant from Warsaw; so that Poland cannot afford to take lightly the possibilities of a conflict with the Soviets.

A more menacing foe, as things are today, would be the Third Reich. Poland's frontier with Germany is very unfavourable. It amounts in all to just over 1900 km. Of this, as much as 1,300 km. is held in common with the Reich proper, the rest with East Prussia

on the north This line is also an open one, though somewhat less mobile than that facing the Soviets It lies at the very door of the Upper Silesian industrial area, and close to Poznań and Gdynia From Warsaw it is distant slightly over 300 km. by air line The swiftness of German mobilisation and the precision of their concentration, the fighting qualities of their armies, their numbers and their wholly modern equipment, will be in time things that no one can question Since the founding of the Third Reich in 1933, the Germans have been arming unceasingly on land, on sea and in the air True, they are as yet weak economically, having no proper reserves of materials In 1914 they had six thousand million gold marks as a fund for war purposes; today, on the best estimate, they have scarcely one The Germans are always short of raw materials. They have motorised and mechanised their forces in too risky a fashion. It will be impossible for them to make fuel for all this by synthetic methods, least of all in war time. For this reason the German war doctrine is based on the strategy of surprise

The General Staff prepares the most powerful blow possible, one which it hopes will be crushing This will be delivered by mechanised troops, supported by a powerful air-force. If these fail at once to destroy the enemy, they will at least acquire a basis for further operations, in the enemy country Without over-estimating these possibilities, especially if the war took on a more general character, one cannot deny the fact that in the Germans Poland would have a very dangerous adversary. No one can deny the initial momentum and power which a German army could achieve in case of war With such a conflict on our western front, violent, sudden as lightning, and made with the help of automobiles and mechanised troops, Poland must always be prepared to reckon.

In résumé, we affirm that as a possible foe, neither of Poland's neighbours can be treated lightly. Neither could be held in check by the assembling of small forces So then, even taking into account the most favourable international situation which a wise foreign policy will try to achieve, Poland in principle must be prepared for war on two fronts—both of them fragile and both of vast extent.

\* \* \* \* \*

The Polish State is not rich. Over three-fifths agricultural, it has a growing industry, and notable mineral wealth. It is thickly populated, by a people conscious of their heritage. Certain parts, for instance Silesia, can compare with the best industrial lands of western Europe. The country can nurture and maintain its popula-



tion, which is thrifty, versatile and hard-working. It possesses the essential and fundamental elements, whose proper development will assure us of a relative measure of self-sufficiency in case of war. The seizure of Poland by any enemy would not indeed give him enormous material advantages, but it might ensure him important gains of a political and military nature. This would be true both for the Soviets and for the Germans. For both these Powers, Poland holds a key position, without which it would be difficult for the latter to enter on the National Socialist project for the crusade eastward, or for the Soviets to attempt the Bolshevisation of Europe.

Military preparedness in any country depends immediately on its territory and its population: on the quality and the quantity of the troops maintained in peace time, on the airplanes, tanks and motor-cars at its disposal, and on the adequacy of its ammunition dumps. But it also depends on the economic state of the country, on its industrial capacity, as well as on the spirit of the nation and the general level of its intelligence. The drive and the endurance of a people is a decisive factor today in the defence of the State. For this reason the system of the "nation in arms", obtaining in Poland, may be a source of inexhaustible energy, in view of the dimensions of our population. It may become the best instrument and guarantee of national safety.

The area of the State is nearly 390,000 sq. km. In the days of the Jagiellons, it was more than twice as much, and was one of the largest in Europe. By contrast, the area of the Soviet Union is over 21,000,000 sq. km., that of Germany 559,000 sq. km. The population of Poland<sup>1</sup> which has been settled on this area since pre-historic days, numbered at the end of 1936 34,222,000. Poles living abroad, in different lands, are counted at 8,000,000. The total of our inhabitants has grown by nearly one-quarter since the end of the Great War. It amounts now to 89 per sq. km. and the birth rate is not slackening. To the east of us, in Soviet Russia there are over 160,000,000 people; while in Greater Germany we find just half that total. These figures of course, reveal a picture that is unfavourable for Poland; but it is not numbers as such that determine the outcome of war. Apart from this, if war should be forced on Poland, she should not have to stand alone. A self chosen seclusion of the Powers west of the Rhine, and a refusal to take any interest in the fate of Central or Eastern Europe would be a grave blunder.

The actual worth of an army depends to-day more than ever on the spirit reigning in its ranks. Here as elsewhere spirit controls

<sup>1</sup> Including, of course, the Ukrainian and White Russian Minorities.—Ed

matter. This spirit is the net resultant of the feelings that inspire the nation, of which in turn a conscript army is only the reflection. In our case the nation is young, and full of vital energy. The peasant element provides some seventy per cent of the whole, and this makes a firm and sure foundation. These men are hard-working, sober, prudent and persevering. They are closely devoted to the soil, and can fight with resolve and heroism to defend it. Thanks to these qualities and to their deeply rooted Christian culture—nine-tenths of them are Catholics—the Poles have withstood the powerful pressure of German materialism. Today their will is being stiffened in the stern school of citizenship. They love freedom, and are ready to defend it. Of old they showed these characteristics, whenever called on. Only when the nation departed from the Piast traditions, did it decline and fall. The year 1920 showed what the common man could do. Reared in the conscious possession of a liberated nation and State, the younger generation will show the same qualities to-day. Their capacity for self-sacrifice is endless.

The 20th century has shown a rise in the strength of national feeling everywhere. In view of this the Red Army changed its name, on the 18th anniversary, to the All-National Army.<sup>2</sup> The concept of "mother-land" is apparently winning back its rights even in Bolshevik circles. So then, the future will belong to those nations, whose feelings for their country amount almost to a religion. All this confirms our contention that the Polish army, outstanding in respect of these qualities, will be a hard one to vanquish.

It would be a mistake, none the less, and one pregnant with unforeseeable consequences, if we should seek safety only in moral forces, as a sure means of defence. We all know too well that the Polish army must possess an out-and-out modern organisation, powerful and disciplined in every detail. We are therefore occupied with providing ourselves with the very newest of technical equipment. This will be served by men, properly skilled in the art of war, and thoroughly schooled to it. Our constant purpose is to motorise and mechanise our units to the full. For Poland nothing is more important than to economise our resources, and we practise this in every rank of command.

In case of war the army will have to face a stern struggle for the freedom of initiative. Its soldiers are thus being trained both for offensive and for defensive action. Our hope is that the army

\* We have been unable to obtain confirmation of this statement.—ED

will be mobile, swift to manœuvre, and quick to strike; but above all that it will be in possession of the qualities that will make possible relentless and unyielding defence.

\* \* \* \* \*

In ancient times, Poland had a system of general muster, introduced by us, as by others, on the German model. The new State cannot use this classic method of defence, depending on mass and numbers. Reversely, it cannot permit itself a picked army of professionals, based on long-term voluntary service. The general muster could not stand against troops equipped with modern weapons, the professional army is too costly. We could not make it large enough to meet the national needs—so manifold are these. The consequence of this is a "nucleus" army, based on general conscription, lasting two years. On this army rests a double obligation. The first is an adequate mastery of military science, and of fitness to meet a sudden assault of any adversary. This is no mean duty, in view of what we know German armaments to be. The second is a schooling in the art of fighting for all citizens, who are put into its ranks when they reach twenty-one. Neither of these tasks is a light one. We shall understand this, if we consider the concrete strategic difficulties of the Polish republic—and take into account the development of modern technique, as well as of the armaments that go with it.

The character of Polish armament is by the nature of things defensive. This is a common feature of all military systems based on the principle of the "nation in arms." A wealth of reserves and of auxiliaries, their mobilisation and the need to absorb them into tactical peace-time units, give rise to delays which put this system at a disadvantage. By comparison with a professional army, always fully ready to strike, this means a certain slowness of movement. What one has to do then, is to see that the distance between the two systems, which thus differ, should be as slight as possible. This is the problem that is especially acute for neighbours of the Third Reich; whose attitude is a defensive one as against the markedly offensive nature of German armaments.

Two-year military service has always been the rule in Poland, even in the days when people were dreaming of disarmament, and the length of military service was being reduced below the minimum. The nation accepted with a will this tribute of blood, with the understanding that women were not involved. It did not take the line expressed on occasion by the students of Oxford, or Glasgow

or Manchester, to the effect that they had no wish to fight for King and Country. Should this attitude become general, the British Empire would have to face serious consequences. Such a view would bring the Poles to a worse pass: the loss of their independence and the collapse of the State. The yearly contingent of recruits in the country is at present over 300,000. Of this number about half are trained each year in the use of the rifle. As is known, the actual army numbers 266,000 men, of which 17,905 are officers and 37,000 are N.C.O.'s. Apart from this the air-force has just under 8,000 men, of which 700 are officers, while the navy numbers 6,000. To the regular army should be added as well the Frontier Protection Corps, whose special duty is the guarding of the eastern borders. This, whether for its personnel, its training or its equipment, is a military élite.

The chief strength of the Polish army lies in its infantry. This is composed of first-class marksmen, and many of them are trained in technical services, so as to fill places that may await them in the army in a modern war. The average soldier proves very suitable material, since he learns quickly. When equipped with the necessary artillery, with anti-tank and anti-aircraft guns as well as with light and heavy machine guns, this infantry presents a mobile and well-knit whole, which can deliver a heavy volume of fire. Every division has its own artillery which can cover the movements of the infantry by precise direction of fire. Such a unit has also its battalion of sappers, its liaison troop equipped with all modern tools, and its motorised patrol troop. It thus forms an efficient whole. A squadron of airmen for observation purposes, detailed to each division, supports it in battle and guides the fire of the batteries.

The endurance and devotion of the Polish infantry have become historical. In the same way the cavalry-man has a long tradition behind him, and it is being maintained today. Our air-pilots have distinguished themselves by unusual daring. They are all choice fighters, and with their modern equipment, they make up a first-class striking force.

A number of model military schools, with the Higher Military Academy at their head, assure the army of a supply of well-trained officers and N.C.O.'s., whose spirit is the finest. Loyal and conscientious, they stand for all that is best in the Polish military tradition, which not even our adversaries will deny. There is in the Polish army none of the old-time "drill," nor are there purely mechanical exercises. The training of the recruit is inspired by the spirit of play. Ambition, and emulation based thereon, have a

very large part in it all. Competitions are frequent—of which the cavalry officers have given samples abroad, and they do much to keep alive this element of healthy rivalry.

A large measure of time and trouble is given to the education of the Polish soldier. It is well understood that human qualities, more than anything else, determine the worth, the efficiency and the perseverance of any army; technical equipment and machines come second. So it has always been; nor is it to be different in the future, when machinery becomes even more complex. For that reason the result of any future war will depend more than in the past on the training and the willingness to fight of the individual man, and of the group. This war will make use of tanks, of airplanes, and of chemicals, and will demand, both from the soldier and from society, a much greater strain on the nerves. The level of intelligence must be higher than of old. Ours is the age of the automobile, the airplane and the radio. The lance and sabre have lost their significance, so have the common rifle, and the old-time big gun. Now their place is taken by the Maxim, the swift-firing howitzer, the tank, the air forces; and with these gas and the wireless. Science is king, more in this field than elsewhere. Poland is therefore concerned to have the equipment of her army kept up to date. Her leaders remember that the concluding battles of the Great War were mostly those of machines. This direction has gone even farther since then: witness the conflicts in Abyssinia, Spain and the Far East.

\* \* \* \* \*

When Poland won back her freedom, she had neither arms nor ammunition. The lack of these was keenly felt in 1918 and 1920. The import of such materials from abroad met with grave obstacles. It is not surprising then, if the Army Leaders from the start have given close attention to the building of an arms industry. This arose directly after the struggle with the Bolsheviks was over, in the so-called Security Triangle, a unit lying right in the heart of Poland's industries. Factories producing powder and high explosives, all kinds of ammunition and rifles, as well as machine guns, were the first to be constructed. Today the infantry have weapons made in Poland. So have the cavalry; and even the artillery, up to the larger calibres. Necessary ammunition is also made at home. Our technical materials are not allowed to get out of date, but are renewed regularly. Thus our foot and horse equipment can stand beside the best in Europe. Only our supplies of automatic rifles are still unsatisfactory. Great concern is shown for good anti-tank artillery. Every regiment

has it, as well as other means of defence against these monsters. Their efficiency has been proved from the experiences of the war in Spain

The further modernising of the army and the time required for it depend on the advance of our industrialisation. The authorities have helped it on by launching the scheme for a Central Industrial Region on the middle Vistula. The general purpose of this is to balance the economic structure of the republic, and to get rid of the differences existing between the western provinces of Poland and the east. All this should enhance the military preparedness of the country, facilitating the provision of modern equipment for all the forces

A word about our navy unit. The Polish naval armament is in process of creation. Its total tonnage is only 15,000 tons. To the fleet belong four torpedo-boat destroyers, and four submarines of 700 tons each. Two more of the latter are building, of 1,000 tons each. Further there are two gunboats, two torpedo boats, four trawlers, and one mine-layer.

Our coast-line is very short, only 140 km—a trifle in comparison with the area of the country. As its guardians we have, since history has been written, the loyal Cassubian stock, which was reunited to the mother nation in 1919. The most vital interests of the nation are bound up with our outlet to the sea. The Baltic links us with the wide world, and assures us of unbroken communication with it. Four-fifths of Poland's foreign trade goes by the sea route. In case of war she would have to import ammunition and equipment from abroad. The shortest way is through Gdynia. What concerns us is that this way should be as sure as is possible. To guard it we must have as strong a naval unit as possible. The beginnings of this navy were made in 1924.

On the Baltic foreshore German interests are in collision with Polish. The Reich would like to obtain supreme control of this sea. It served them well during the world war, securing them safe transport of Swedish ore right up to the armistice. At this point the blockade was ineffective. Today too German armoured cruisers—the "pocket" ones, are intended to keep the upper hand in the Baltic, which will not be easy in view of the task the German fleet has in the North Sea. It was to make this task easier that the Kiel Canal was built forty years ago.

The modest Polish navy, built to operate in closed waters, will have a useful part to play, when co-operating with the navies of our

allies. In any case, along with the fleets of the other Baltic powers, it stands for the freedom of the seas for all.

\* \* \* \* \*

In conclusion, I return to the human element in all this. The first mark of the good soldier is obedience. In this the Polish army excels. But blind obedience, demanded by military discipline, is not enough. One needs in addition an intelligent sense, practical, with energy to back it. This too our army possesses, and its inner atmosphere is pervaded by a mutual confidence existing between the officers and the men. On it rest the pillars of solidarity, without which no army can be a good one.

The concept of honour and duty which animates our men has little in common with the ideas about them that have come down from the middle ages. The Polish army is a democratic one, built on the duty of all to serve. In order to function, it must be moved by ideals which enthuse the masses. Our soldiers work in the atmosphere of affection with which the nation regards the whole army. The nation has never been militarist, but it has always cherished, and still cherishes a military spirit. The virtues of the soldier have always appealed to its imagination. It has ruled the army out of political conflicts and disputes, and demands from it in return devotion to its single task. Taught by experience, the Poles instinctively know that the higher the professional standard of their forces, the better will be served the defence of the State, and the more easily will any adversary be turned back. None the less this demands great sacrifices from the citizen body. And in the hour when the veil of history is raised, and the brutal reality of modern war is laid bare, Poland will set might against might, and power against the most powerful of foes. In the service of the commonwealth the armed forces will then gather and unite the whole nation around their standards, in defence of the common good. Zeal will be followed by action, and this should lead to victory.

WŁADYSŁAW SIKORSKI.

## SEPARATIST TENDENCIES AMONG THE RUSSIAN ÉMIGRÉS

BITTERNESS of political feelings, irreconcilable and exaggerated political judgments · these are the characteristics of every group of émigrés. In view of the dictatorship of the Communist Party and its ruthless régime, all these general émigré qualities are especially strongly reflected among the émigrés of the various peoples of the Soviet Union. Therefore separatist theories are categorical and tolerate no compromises. If one takes into account the extremely complicated post-war international situation, with various States seeking not only present but future allies, it is not surprising that the development of Russian separatism meets with general moral and material support from various States. Even the most negligible, even the most comical separatist groups find their protectors.

In this atmosphere no less than ten different émigré groups have been organised in Europe and in Asia, considering themselves the representatives of future separatist States. Hatred of the Communist régime is a main factor in the development of separatism. This is true not only of non-Russian peoples, but also of right-wing Russian émigrés. So, with the development of the Russo-Japanese antagonism, some extreme right-wing circles (the newspaper *Vozrozhdenie*) have clearly sympathised with Japan in the hope that the latter, in co-operation with the émigrés, will organise in the Far East a buffer state, which will serve as an émigré base.

The Ukrainians are the most developed and the most uncompromising in their ideology of separatism. Among these émigrés there are no waverings and no differences in the question of separation from Russia. There are differences of opinion only about the choice of allies and about the future of independent Ukraine and its form of government. The strongest Ukrainian emigrant group, the Petlyurists, are oriented on Poland. Despite the fact that purely Ukrainian territories (Galicia, Volhynia and Holm) are now included in Poland, the Petlyurists entirely put aside the question of uniting the whole of Ukraine and try to win the independence of only one part of it, the part which is now within the frontiers of the Soviet Union.

The centre of this group is in Paris, where their weekly *Trizub* is published. Their representative organ is called the Uryad of the Ukrainian People's Republic. This really consists of the remnants of the Petlyurist Government. After the assassination of Petlyura,



Andrey Levitsky, who lives in Poland, became head of the Uryad, which is in the closest, most friendly relations with the émigré representative bodies of other peoples of Russia. But, for tactical and diplomatic considerations, it tries to hold aloof from the separatists of White Russia, because it does not want to quarrel with Poland, which has about three million White Russians in its territory

During recent years a semi-Fascist Ukrainian group has been organised in Prague, publishing its magazine, *Rozbudova Natsi*. This group, which consists largely of representatives of the young generation, disagrees sharply with all the older groups, cherishes sympathy for Germany and is strongly anti-Polish

Altogether there are about 100,000 Ukrainian emigrants. Apart from political work, they carry on scientific and cultural activity. Some middle and higher Ukrainian schools have been created, books and magazines are published; scientific institutes are functioning. But this work is also clearly coloured with Russophobe sentiment. Any sort of co-operation of an Ukrainian with a Russian, even in the sphere of science, is barred. One learned Ukrainian went so far as to assert that the Ukrainians are really not Slavs, but are of Celtic origin. This is eccentricity, but an eccentricity which is characteristic of separatist sentiments.

Emigrants from the various peoples of the Caucasus represent a large and politically organised group. It has various organisations of separate peoples and also a united committee for the independence of the Caucasus. The main centres of these organisations are Paris and Warsaw. Among the Caucasian emigrants are representatives of the following peoples: Armenians, Georgians, Azerbaidjan Tartars and Caucasian mountain tribes. All these national groups, with the exception of the Armenians, have been co-operating for many years. They publish their organ, *Prometheus*, which started nine years ago, in the French language, and in Brussels in July, 1934, they signed a special pact about a future Caucasian Federation. This pact contains the following six points.

(1) The Caucasian Federation, guaranteeing internally the national character and sovereignty of each of the republics, will act externally in the name of all the republics. The Federation will have a common political and customs frontier.

(2) The foreign policy of the federated republics will be guided by the competent organs of the Federation.

(3) The defence of the frontiers of the Federation will be entrusted to the army of the Federation, composed of the armies

of the federated republics, under a united command, subordinated to the governing bodies of the Federation.

(4) Any disagreement which may arise between the federated republics and which cannot be settled by direct negotiations, must be referred to compulsory arbitration or to the supreme court of the Federation. The federated republics are bound to accept unconditionally and to fulfill all such decisions.

(5) A commission of experts will undertake in the immediate future to work out a draft constitution for the Caucasian Federation, taking into account the above-mentioned principles. This draft will be the basis for the work of the first constituent assembly of each republic.

(6) A place is reserved for the Armenian Republic in this pact.

Preliminary negotiations between the other Caucasian émigrés and the Armenians have failed to yield any concrete results, because the latter failed to receive satisfactory assurances about the recovery of Armenian territory now included in Turkey and on defence against possible future Turkish aggression. Consequently, the Armenians did not associate themselves with the pact, which was signed by representatives of the émigré groups of Georgia, Azerbaijan and the North Caucasus. This pact was in course of preparation for almost ten years. The threat of war in the Far East, which seemed imminent at the beginning of 1934, and the possibility that difficulties might arise in this connection in the Soviet Union caused the Caucasian emigrants to hasten with the conclusion of the pact.

Siberian separatism has recently made its appearance among the émigrés of the Far East. Even before the Revolution there was a so-called regional movement among the Siberians. But this was not a political movement, but a general cultural tendency within the limits of the Russian State.

During the last two or three years a movement has been organised in Harbin, advocating complete separation of Siberia from Russia, its inclusion in the number of Asiatic States, and complete union with Japan as the strongest and most advanced power of the Pacific area. The outstanding representatives of this movement are some former Ministers of the Siberian anti-Bolshevik Government during the period of civil war and also the editorial staff of the Harbin newspaper, *Gumbau*, the editor of which is Professor M. P. Golovachev, former Minister of the Siberian Government.

The ideology and the tactics of this Siberian separatism are expounded in a brochure which Golovachev has published under the

title *The Siberian Movement and the International Situation* Golovachev, like other separatists, starts from the assumption that the Siberians made a fundamental mistake during the civil war when they tried to fight Bolshevism on an all-Russian scale instead of trying to protect Siberia, as an independent state, against the Communist International

Moreover, the theory is developed that the Siberians are a special people. In Siberia, according to Golovachev, daily life and the economic structure have developed along different lines from those of European Russia. There has developed a special type of Siberian, representing a new branch of the Great Russian tree, with strongly marked Asiatic features, to which the historic past of the Russian has made no small contribution

Golovachev says that the Siberian movement will solve satisfactorily the problem of the Russian nation, which is beginning to live in Asiatic conditions and is threatened by physical destruction, moral deterioration and internal denationalisation. The salvation of the Siberian branch of the Russian nation under present circumstances represents the sole real achievement which is possible. In this question the Siberian movement definitely relies on Japan, notwithstanding any demagogic reproaches

The Siberian separatists affirm the Pan-Asiatic idea not in the racial sense, but in the sense of a territorial unity of interests of the peoples who live on this continent. This unity is conceived as aiming not only at a united defence of common interests, but also at co-operation in the creation of an Asiatic culture. They regard this Asiatic culture not as opposed to world civilisation, but as a special factor of independent significance. Only if Siberia participates in the general and cultural development of Asia, will the question of co-operation between the white and yellow races be solved satisfactorily.

The separatist trend has spread even to very small groups among the émigrés. Thus, a minority of the Cossacks living outside Russia, calling themselves Free Cossacks, have put forward the theory that the Cossacks are a special Slav people and have worked out the boundaries of a future Cossack State. The Tartars of the Volga have followed their example and have made sweeping demands for an independent Tartar State, based on doubtful ethnographic figures.

S. POSTNIKOV.

## THE ORIGINS OF THE SCHOOL OF SLAVONIC STUDIES

THE publication of the fiftieth number of the *Slavonic Review* coincides with the realisation of a long postponed dream—the entry of the School of Slavonic and East European Studies into a permanent building of its own, preserving its own identity within the framework of the new University “Campus”. These two events follow closely upon the twentieth anniversary of Czechoslovak independence which we were preparing to celebrate with special joy in the new “Masaryk Hall”—in view of our School’s close association with the late President Masaryk and of the fact that but for the generous endowments put forward since 1930 by the Czechoslovak Government, the School would still be without a home of its own.

My colleagues have pressed me very strongly on this occasion to place on record without further delay all that I know of the origins of our School. In complying with their request, I should have preferred to keep my own person out of the narrative: but when I came to refresh my memory by studying the documents available, I very soon saw that this could not be done. The result is laid with some diffidence before the reader.

Beyond all question the initiative for the foundation of the School and for its original policy and aims lay with Ronald Burrows, then Principal of King’s College. In addition to his many-sided interests in archæology, in higher education and in social reform, Burrows was an ardent Philhellene, to whom Venizelos or Constantine were certainly not less alive or less interesting than Pericles or Philip: and for him Greece became a window through which the whole Near and Middle East gradually opened upon his view, and Greece’s relations with the other Balkan States brought him by degrees into the sphere of Danubian and Central European politics, which became so burning an issue in 1914. I first met him at a meeting of the Balkan Committee, which I had been asked to address in July, 1913, after four months spent in Austria and the Balkans during the long crisis of the Balkan Wars; and I still have vivid memories of a conversation as we walked away together from the House of Commons. Here, I felt, was the sort of man for whom I was looking, with vision, sympathy and “drive,” capable of visualising these complex problems as a whole, and fully aware that despite all the indifference of public opinion, they might at any moment exercise a direct and vital influence upon British policy.

Soon after the outbreak of war in 1914, when some of us were organising relief work for the Serbs, Burrows was one of the first to join the executive of the Serbian Relief Fund and to take an active interest in the political no less than the purely humanitarian aspects of the problem. Early in 1915 he organised a course of lectures at King's College on "The Spirit of the Allies," which was afterwards published in book form, and it is in this connection that I have found the first written record of a scheme which was already evolving in his mind

"Before my lecture last week" [this was "The Spirit of the Serb"], so I wrote to him on 15 March, 1915,<sup>1</sup> "you said just a few words in conversation which showed me that your mind is moving in the direction of a scheme which I have long been thinking of, even before the war made it 'actuel' or political. The neglect of Slavonic studies and of East European history has been complete in this country, and though a little has been done for Russian at Liverpool, the other Slav languages have hardly even been thought of anywhere. London seems to me to be the obvious centre for such pioneer work, and King's College and the London School of Economics the most natural centres in London. The foundation of the Russia Society seems to be rather a favourable moment for following out the idea. Might it not be practicable to organise some kind of 'Slavonic School,' in connection with King's, beginning with a library on Slavonic subjects and gradually extending to lecture work. If properly run, it could from the first form a focus for all students of any Slavonic race in London, and act as a medium between them and people interested in Slavonic studies.

"I believe it should be possible to get a good deal of practical support for such a scheme in wartime, it need not be run on absurdly ambitious lines. Personally I would gladly undertake, as soon as peace restores the connection with Central Europe, to equip such a library with the main classics of Czech, Slovak, Serbo-Croat and Bulgarian literature and the necessary philological works and dictionaries dealing with these languages and to contribute annually to the funds of such a library. A nucleus would soon be formed, to which one could add more gradually. Other people would soon be found to do the same for Russian and Polish, which would be the two *pièces de résistance*.

"The Southern Slav exiles are going to make this country their headquarters till better times arrive. This would be a small but effective proof of interest on the part of this country.

<sup>1</sup>All the letters quoted in this article come from the dossier of my correspondence with Ronald Burrows, and from the archives of King's College, kindly placed at my disposal by Mr. S. T. Shovelton, Secretary of the College.

‘ I don’t know enough about King’s to know whether housing room would be a serious problem. It would be very nice to have a chance of talking over such a scheme with you some time ’

To this Dr. Burrows replied on 18 March :—

“ I am much attracted by your idea, and I hope we shall be able to follow it up. At the present moment there is a nice and quiet room, which could be devoted primarily, and if the School got large enough to justify it, entirely, to a Slavonic Library, and conferences and lectures on Slavonic subjects. I agree with you that it would be an opportune moment to raise the question. Two or three weeks ago a question was asked in the House by Sir J. D. Rees about the teaching of Russian, and it was answered that the Government had it under consideration. I have been in communication since then with Dr. Frank Heath of the Board of Education, and find that a conference is about to take place between the Board and the Foreign Office on the subject, and that though no doubt the primary subject under discussion will be Commercial Russian, the further question of University teaching is sure to come up. I put our College point of view to Dr. Heath, and he said he thought it would be a wise thing for me to give him full information, and that he would try to help our objects.”

Dr. Heath also suggested approaching Mr. Neil Primrose, then Under Secretary of Foreign Affairs and a leading spirit of the Russia Society, and Dr. Burrows considered approaching him through his father, Lord Rosebery, then Chancellor of the University, but I cannot remember whether he actually did so. At this moment there was already a Professor of Russian language at King’s College, Mr. Nicholas Orloff. but he was old and on the point of retiring. The Russian side of the question, besides being infinitely the most important—and more than ever so, owing to the new ties produced by the war alliance between Russia and Britain and the urgent need for linguistic and other contacts—was forcing itself upon Burrows’ attention in the most practical way, because, as he wrote, “ the great majority of the Russian Refugee students, especially in Medicine and Engineering, have come to us, and we have about 70 of them at the present moment.” In all our conversations the most urgent need was the establishment of a Russian department, on far wider lines than those of mere language teaching, and everything depended upon finding first a suitable head. The obvious name, which at once occurred to us, was that of Bernard Pares, then Professor of Russian at Liverpool University, who as early as 1907 had founded there a School of Russian Studies with four university posts, and in 1912 with the help of the late Harold

young and little-known lecturer in economics at Prague University, and of Milan Štefaník, a young Slovak astronomer serving as a volunteer in the French air force. The question of funds also played a vital part; and the exiles had above all to rely upon the support of the Czech and Slovak colonies in America, which took a certain time to organise. A further factor was decisive for Masaryk's whole plan of campaign—the question of the probable duration of the war, for to him it was clear from the very outset that Bohemian independence could only be won if the war lasted several years, and hence the knowledge that Kitchener regarded this as inevitable had made a great impression on him. His preliminary visit to London in April and May, 1915, showed him how little British public opinion, and even official circles, knew of Central European problems and in particular of the Czechs and Southern Slavs and he then decided that it would be necessary to make London his headquarters and devote himself to propagandist efforts. He was travelling on a Serbian passport assigned to him at the orders of the then Premier Nicholas Pašić, and he was in the closest touch with Supilo and the other Croat exiles, and it was his very special authority in all Southern Slav matters that led Steed and me to send him a telegram urging him to hasten his arrival in London. It was the decisive moment when the negotiations for Italy's entry on the allied side were about to culminate in the secret Treaty of London, which handed over to her compact masses of Slavs along the Istrian and Dalmatian coast. Masaryk naturally could not expose himself in the Yugoslav cause, without risking injury to his own, at a time when he was preparing his first memorandum for the British Foreign Office: and he was prevented by illness from carrying out his original intentions of accompanying Dr. Trumbić and other delegates of the Yugoslav Committee, when they in their turn were allowed to present a memorandum for Sir Edward Grey. But from a more discreet place in the background he gave effective proof of that belief in the solidarity of the Czechoslovak and Yugoslav causes on which he was to act consistently throughout the war.

It was at this stage that Burrows and I first discussed the idea of enlisting the support of Masaryk for a new venture in the University of London. In a certain sense it would be like killing two birds with one stone: his eminence in the academic world would stand us in good stead, but he, too, would acquire a new status in exile and a forum from which to plead an unfamiliar cause. In May he had gone back to Paris and Geneva, and it was in the latter city that he first came into the open politically, by joining

Ernest Denis in a remarkable demonstration on the 500th anniversary of the martyrdom of John Hus after that he was to return to London for a prolonged stay. Meanwhile we on our side, in a more modest way, organised a quincenary lecture at King's College, presided over by Dean Wace of Canterbury,<sup>3</sup> and on the day itself (5 July) a public meeting at the Æolian Hall, at which Lord Bryce was the principal speaker. We also collected the signatures of about 30 prominent Oxford Dons for a letter to *The Times*, expressing sympathy from the land of Wychffe to the land of Hus.

On 24 June, after several preliminary talks Burrows wrote to me as follows —

"You are quite clear, are you not, that I want you to go ahead definitely with the Slavonic scheme for next autumn, as far as it affects Masaryk? I should like you, that is to say, to write to him asking him definitely whether he will accept the post for the year beginning in October, and whether, if so, he would give lectures during the autumn term. You would naturally state that the appointment would have to be actually made by the Governing Body, but I have not the least hesitation on that point. . . . The idea would, I suppose, be to ask Masaryk only to give literary and historic-philosophical lectures, of which there could hardly be more than two a week for two terms, or even for one term. He would hardly be willing to give any drudgery lectures in language, even if there was at the present moment any chance of students for Czech or Polish. . . . The title we suggest for Masaryk is 'Lecturer in Slavonic History and Literature.'"

At the same time he expressed his intention of proposing me to the Professorial Board of King's College as "Honorary Lecturer in Slavonic," in order "to have your name definitely associated with the School." I, of course, had to convince him that I was quite unqualified for such a title, and I therefore became "Honorary Lecturer in East European History" in July, 1915.

On 25 June<sup>4</sup> I wrote to Masaryk, informing him that

"Dr. Burrows officially asks me to approach you in the matter and to invite you to consider seriously your acceptance of the post of lecturer on Slavonic History and Literature (or a similar title to be arranged later) from October next till Xmas. The appointment would

<sup>3</sup> Answering Burrows' description as "a prominent Protestant" This lecture I afterwards published under the title of "The Future of Bohemia"

<sup>4</sup> It was on the same day that a letter and article "written by a Canadian interned in Galicia," (in reality Silesia) reached Dr. Burrows from Dr. Parkin, secretary of the Rhodes Trust. Its author, W. J. Rose, is today Professor of Polish Language and Literature at our School.



be for a year, but if you found it impossible to lecture after Xmas, the winter course would be sufficient! There would not be more than two lectures a week, and you would be given absolute and complete latitude as to treatment of the subject. The idea is to treat the Slavs as a whole, from the "literary and historic-philosophical" side. The University would see that you had a representative audience—not *merely* students. We should get special Chairmen to introduce you, and the course would be published afterwards, and we should try to give as much publicity as possible. May I urge you *very strongly*, on my own behalf, to accept? I am sure it is much the most practical way of arousing interest and sympathy for the cause you have at heart . . ."

On 8 July Masaryk replied, "Your plan is excellent, I told you so in London—but I am not quite sure that I would be the lecturer you wish and expect." He then summed up the objections under four heads, in a manner altogether characteristic of the man. In the first place he himself would be fatally handicapped in the preparation of his lectures because he would be without his library, and doubted whether it would be possible to provide a satisfactory substitute under war conditions, Russian, Polish and Czech books having become virtually unprocurable in the West. Secondly, he could not direct the studies of his students without a good library of working material—grammars, dictionaries, etc. Thirdly, he pointed out that "Slavic studies were subordinate in my scientific career: as you see from my first book (on Suicide), it is Sociology and Ethics (with Philosophy of Religion) which interested me directly. Then I became a politician, and although I tried to be well-informed in all Slavic questions, I would not dare to call myself a Slavist. I know Bohemia and Russia tolerably well, the rest only a little. I doubt, therefore, whether I have the right to lecture even on such a theme as you propose. Yet I think I could give a tolerably good lecture on 'Sociological Introduction to the Study of the Slav Nations,' or something of this kind, but only in case I could get my books, which I will try very seriously to do." Finally "there is one great drawback to the plan—my political work," which would inevitably take him from London to Paris and Geneva, perhaps even to Rome, Niš and Petrograd. He therefore hesitated to give a "decided no or yes," until October, though he would try to answer sooner.

## II

While Masaryk's acceptance was in abeyance, we made real progress with the Yugoslav section of our scheme. During 1915

London assumed a position of great importance for the Southern Slavs, and the fate of their whole coast was at stake during the secret negotiations of the Triple Entente with Italy. The Yugoslav Committee made London their centre from May onwards, and with our very active help were able to launch their appeal to the British nation on behalf of Yugoslav Unity, just on the eve of Italy's entry into the war. Meanwhile the heroic resistance of the Serbian army and its sufferings during the typhus epidemic roused popular sympathy and support for the various relief organisations working for the Serbs · and, with the object of bringing home to a wider public the political issues at stake, we organised an exhibition of Meštrović's sculpture at the Victoria and Albert Museum, intended to show that Rodin's greatest pupil and the inspired interpreter of Serbo-Croat unity in stone was a Croat peasant from those very Dalmatian uplands which were in danger of being ceded to Italy. Realising the growing interest in their cause and the rival propaganda in favour of an " Italian " Dalmatia, the Serbian Government very wisely supplemented the staff at their Legation by several of their most distinguished savants—notably Jovan Cvijić, the greatest authority on Balkan geography and ethnography, and the brothers Bogdan and Pavle Popović, Serbia's two foremost literary historians and critics (all three were professors at Belgrade University, and the latter was the official link between the Government and the otherwise entirely independent Yugoslav Committee). It was obviously desirable to invite these men to give special lectures at our own and other universities, and we also consulted them as to the possibility of obtaining a small subsidy from the Niš Government, with a view to inaugurating teaching in Serbo-Croat at King's College. In order to set the ball rolling I offered a contribution of my own, and Cvijić, who was returning to Niš early in July, was confident of obtaining official support. He undertook to urge support and endowment for the Masaryk appointment : as Dr. Burrows himself put it in a letter to the Serbian Minister, " The Committee feels that to attract Professor Masaryk to London and to make him the centre of a comprehensive political propaganda would mark an era in the relations between England and the Slav world." In actual fact, the Serbian grant of £100, which was offered by telegram from Niš, was the first outside contribution to the work of organising the School · but our suggestion that it should be applied to the endowment of Masaryk's temporary chair was not taken up. As, however, the University was not yet in a position to make a permanent appointment in Serbo-Croat, we looked round

for someone suitable for a temporary and improvised post. By the end of September the choice fell upon Mr. Srgjan Tucić, a Croat dramatist of real talent, who found himself stranded in England when war broke out, together with his nephew, a very gifted violinist. His two plays, *Golgotha* and *The Liberators*, were brilliantly rendered into English by Mme Copeland, and the latter was published in 1916, with a preface of mine, by Frank Bullen of the Bodley Head at Stratford. It was a very eloquent and moving plea for fraternal unity between Serb and Bulgar, and was to have been played in London, with Henry Ainley in the leading part. But after Bulgaria entered the war on the side of the central Powers its effect would have been altogether too poignant, and the project had to be abandoned.

Meanwhile, in the last days of July, Bernard Pares returned from the Russian front, bearing messages for the Foreign Office and War Office as to the crisis in Russian armaments. I first met him at the house of Mr. St. Loe Strachey, editor of the *Spectator*, who had convoked an extremely confidential meeting of high officials, editors, and a few free lances like myself, to discuss the grim realities of Eastern Europe; and again next day at lunch with Harold Cox, of the *Edinburgh Review*. He, of course, saw Burrows, gave his blessing to our efforts and, while as yet unable to take any share because he was returning hot haste to Russia, made it clear that we should have his whole-hearted co-operation as soon as peace returned. On 31 August Burrows wrote to me as follows —

“ I am very glad you have had a talk with Pares and sent him on to me. I had a long talk with him, and have hopes that his co-operation may be really useful. He would like, I think, ultimately to have a part-time post with us as Director or Professor, with language and other teachers under him. His connection with Russia is so strong that it is worth consideration. Meanwhile he is delighted with your appointment and with the idea of Masaryk, and very much wants us to secure as a language teacher of Russian his assistant at Liverpool, by name Trofimov, whom he thinks very highly of, and who is a graduate of Petrograd.”<sup>5</sup>

Burrows at once acted on his advice, the more so as he found it fully endorsed by the Russian Ambassador, Count Benckendorff who

<sup>5</sup> In a letter of 13 January, 1916, Burrows says that “ Pares himself had a distinct hope in view that his own activities and those of the *Russian Review* should ultimately be transferred from Liverpool to our School in London, but that he does not wish the question to be raised in connection with himself till after the war ”

"was in general harmony with anything thought by Pares, whom he clearly trusts." A temporary financial guarantee was provided until funds for the proper endowment of Russian were forthcoming—the object being "to enable us to go straight ahead without a moment's delay" (7 October 1915)

Above all, on 26 September I was able to notify Burrows that

"Masaryk has arrived, and after a conversation with me has agreed in principle (1) to become Professor of Slavonic for one year at King's College, (2) to give two inaugural lectures in November (one general, one on Bohemia), and full course for next term to be arranged in consultation with you. It was half playfully decided between us that the task of finally overcoming his conscientious scruples is to devolve on you!"

Burrows greeted the news with enthusiasm. At the outset he had to explain that the University regulations made it impossible to give Masaryk the full title of Professor "if his stay was to be a long one it might, in consideration of his eminence, make him a part-time Professor, but that would take some negotiation." In asking me to draw up "a summary of Masaryk's titles, career and published work" he added, "We must remember that England is ignorant, and that we must make an impression on the political and learned world as to our friend's greatness. Do you think that we could get Sir Edward Grey to take the chair at his Inaugural Lecture?"

Henceforth Burrows was untiring in his efforts to ensure that the School should be well launched, and the Prime Minister, Mr. Asquith, was persuaded to take the chair in person. Unhappily, when the day came he was in bed with influenza, but in his place he sent the worthiest of substitutes in the person of Lord Robert Cecil, then Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs, and destined after the war to a long and close association at Geneva with the representatives of the future Czechoslovak President. On 19 October, then, Professor Masaryk inaugurated the School of Slavonic Studies at King's College, before a crowded audience, choosing as his subject "The Problem of Small Nations in the European Crisis."<sup>6</sup> It is true that the moment was unfortunate, for it coincided with the invasion of Serbia and the failure of the Western Powers to send the necessary reinforcements. (Incidentally, it also coincided with a succession of frantic joint efforts, on the part of Burrows and myself, behind the scenes of Whitehall and in

<sup>6</sup> Published as No. 2 in the "Foreign Series" of C S I R. (Council for the Study of International Relations)

Fleet Street, to urge the vital importance of the Yugoslav and Greek questions for the whole future conduct of the war.) How inadequately these issues were understood in Downing Street was revealed in the message of apology sent by the Prime Minister to be read aloud at the meeting. "I congratulate King's College on Professor Masaryk's appointment," so that message ran, "and I can assure him that we welcome his advent to London, both as a teacher—the influence of whose power and learning is felt throughout the Slav world—and as a man to whose personal qualities of candour, courage and strength we all are glad to pay a tribute. We believe that his presence here will be a link to strengthen the sympathy which unites the people of Russia and Great Britain. First and foremost the Allies are fighting for the liberties of small nations, to the end that they may be left in future free from the tyranny of their more powerful neighbours to develop their own national life and institutions. Above all, today our thoughts and sympathies are moved towards Serbia, whose undaunted courage wins day by day our unbounded sympathy and admiration." The audience might have been excused for supposing that Masaryk was a Russian, there was no mention whatsoever of Bohemia and the Czechs, and the phrases about Serbia were in bitter contrast to her actual treatment by the Allies.

Today there is no need for concealing the fact that Burrows and I, knowing Masaryk's disgust and alarm at the general situation, were apprehensive till the last moment that he might wish to cry off or at least postpone the whole enterprise. Two days before the lecture Burrows sent me the latest details of a project for Greek intervention of which he was the chief sponsor with the Foreign Office, and added "You may tell Masaryk in strict confidence. It will make him happier on Tuesday." The Greek project was completely bungled, for reasons which lie far outside the present narrative—but, for better or for worse, the more humble vessel of the School of Slavonic Studies was safely launched under the auspices of one who has been compared, without a trace of exaggeration, to the Philosopher King of Plato's ideal, and of another whose unwearying work for a new international order, with its centre at Geneva, may at the present moment be obscured by clouds of craven ingratitude, but will shine out all the more clearly when History comes to write the record of our present chaos.

For the remainder of the war King's College was a centre of all Slav activities, and it is characteristic of Burrows' energy that Masaryk's inauguration was immediately followed by an attempt

to launch Polish studies also. After various vicissitudes (in which four Poles of great but varied distinction were invited to lecture at King's<sup>7</sup> thanks to the generous endowment of two Russian Poles, MM. Lednicki and Witenberg) a former graduate of the London School of Economics, Mr August Zaleski, then an exile in London and Geneva, but a confidential representative of the future Marshal Pilsudski, filled with distinction the post of Hon. Lecturer in Polish until after the war a more permanent arrangement could be reached. Thus it came about that two of our war-time teachers became first President of the Czechoslovak Republic and Foreign Minister of Poland respectively. But all these arrangements were necessarily entirely provisional, and it was not until the return of Bernard Pares from Siberia and his appointment to the London County Council's newly founded Chair of Russian in the University of London that steps could be taken to place the School on a permanent and scientific basis. The unbounded hospitality and generosity with which King's College presided over the School's first infancy will always be gratefully remembered by all connected with it: and it has been a permanent grief to us that Ronald Burrows did not live to see the School's further development.

R. W. SETON-WATSON.

<sup>7</sup> Mr. Dmowski, leader of the Russophil National Democrats in the Duma, and Professors Baudoin de Courtenay, Zdziechowski and Askenazi.

## SLAVONIC STUDIES IN THE UNITED STATES, 1918-1938

THOUGH the Great War was by no means responsible for the birth of Slavonic studies in the United States, the revolutionary consequences of the War upon the Slav world and the complete reversal of fortune it brought to so much of Slavdom, both individually and collectively, greatly accelerated their expansion. The War may be said to have fertilised the study of Slavonic culture in American colleges and universities in three ways. First of all, the War itself, and later its aftermath of Relief Administrations, Peace Commissions and the like, caused the personal careers of a great many young men whose lives might otherwise have remained insularly American to be drawn into the very vortex of the convulsions that agitated the Slav world from 1914 to 1924. Americans from every State of the Union were for years to be found from Cheb to Vladivostok, from Sofia to Warsaw. By the middle twenties, therefore, when many of the projects undertaken from 1917 on had to be liquidated, young men having a personal acquaintance with a Slavonic country and frequently, even, a practical knowledge of a Slav tongue came to be scattered all over the United States from New York to California. During the same period, and indirectly as a consequence of the war, American Slavonic studies had their potentiality enormously increased through migration to the United States of educated Slavs, among them not only a reservoir of potential language teachers, but also mature scholars, particularly Russian, who were qualified to step without delay into university posts. Finally, the War made it imperative for a great many American scholars whose interests were primarily educational theory, the drama, diplomatic history or economics to carry their studies into the hitherto underworked Slavonic field. Once drawn into that field, some remained, fascinated alike by its novelty and its importance.

### I

In the decade following the War the first generation of Americans whose chief interest was Slavonic languages, history or literature completed its work. In 1930 Wiener of Harvard retired, just a year before Golder of Stanford died.

The generation represented by Wiener and Golder had no ancestors. before these there had been only a Yankee "character"

and a German professor's daughter, only two persons able in any sense of the word to qualify as forerunners of today's American Slavists. The one was James Gates Percival, of the class of 1815 at Yale, a poet and recluse, the other, Talvj, the German wife of Percival's schoolmate, Dr Edward Robinson. Neither Percival's Slavonic studies nor Talvj's were centered round a university, yet both approached Slavonics with a truly scholarly spirit. Talvj's *Historical View of the Language and Literature of the Slavs* (N.Y., 1850), based on Šafařík, is still remembered, Percival's translations and linguistic dissertations are almost forgotten. Neither Talvj nor Percival, however, left a single disciple, and a long gap in Slavonic studies ensued in America after these two abandoned them.

In 1896 a new period opened. Through the energy of Archibald Cary Coolidge,<sup>1</sup> whose interest in the Slavs was fired by a year's residence in 1890-1891 in St Petersburg as acting secretary of the American Legation, Harvard University was persuaded in that year to offer for the first time a course in the Russian Language. Its teacher was Leo Wiener, America's first professional Slavist. From that beginning in 1896 stems not only Harvard's Slavic Department but also the one at the University of California, for George Rapall Noyes, its chairman, like Cross of Harvard, was Professor Wiener's student.

From Harvard also, though not from Professor Wiener's department, came the two men responsible for the most serious specialised research published in the period just before the War. The two were Robert H. Lord and Frank A. Golder. Robert Lord's study of *The Second Partition of Poland* (1915) is a classic in its field, and it is a pity the promise it held had to be cut short of realisation through the retirement from Slavonic scholarship of its brilliant author. Since, however, Lord is living, it is not too much to hope that he will in his own good time make further contributions to knowledge of a field he once so ably illuminated.

Frank Golder, oriented towards the Pacific through his residence in the state of Washington, pioneered in the field he staked out for himself with a work on *Russian Expansion on the Pacific, 1641-1850* (1914). Called in 1917 from his professorship at Washington State College to serve as an expert on Colonel House's Committee of Inquiry, Golder was soon sent to Russia to study the archives and to make a report of the materials they contained.

<sup>1</sup> On the far-reaching work of this greatest of pioneers see *Slavonic Review*, Vol. XI, No 33, pp. 607-616.



pertaining to American history. Later, as a member of the American Relief Administration, he went to Russia for the second time. After 1924 Golder's time was occupied principally in editing Russian Documents for the Hoover War Library at Stanford University (Palo Alto, California). The work Golder initiated in this field has since his death (1929) been carried forward by the Stanford group of historians headed by Harold Henry Fisher.

Fisher is one of the younger men who can thank the War and its aftermath for the Slavonic slant his studies in history have taken. Having before him the vast resources of the Hoover Library when he went to Stanford as a lecturer in History, Fisher turned to the Slavic collections as a natural consequence of the work he had done with the American Relief Administration in Russia. In 1927 appeared his chronicle of *The Famine in Soviet Russia, 1919-1923*, and the next year his *America and the New Poland*. Since that time Fisher's work has been directly with documents: with a group of associates and translators he has gradually edited portions of the Russian material in the Hoover Library. Thus in 1934 came documents and materials on *The Bolshevik Revolution, 1917-1918*, a sequel to Golder's *Documents of Russian History, 1914-1917* (1927), followed in 1935 by *The Testimony of Kolchak and Other Siberian Material* and *Out of My Past*, the Memoirs of Count Kokovtsev, Russian Minister of Finance, 1904-1914 and Prime Minister, 1911-1914.

Another individual whose studies were given a Slavonic slant through personal acquaintance with a Slavonic country as a result of the War is Jerome Davis. From 1916 to 1918 Davis was engaged in Y.M.C.A. War Work in Russia, so that he learned at first hand the background of the Russian immigrant in the United States. Davis's experience of that background impelled him to choose the Russian rather than some other immigrant group for study when the time came later on for him to undertake the first of his inquiries into social adjustment in the United States, *The Russian Immigrant* (1922). Davis's close ties with Russia subsequently confirmed if they did not induce his social and economic theories, leading him to write in 1933 *The New Russia*, a study of Soviet Russia between the First Five-Year Plan and the Second. They helped, undoubtedly, to make Davis the provocative theorist and the stormy academic he became as a professor at Yale.

The Slavist best known to readers of the *Slavonic Review* whose orientation derives from his War experiences is, of course, William J. Rose. Americans know that Professor Rose is a Canadian, but

they like to recall that it was from one of their own colleges (Dartmouth) that he was called to make the regional study he has since published as *The Drama of Upper Silesia* (1935)

It would be an interesting piece of research into human interrelationships to track down the numberless young men who, listed in our college catalogues as offering courses in general history of English or sociology, are actually expounding the Slavs, in consequence of years they spent during or just after the War in some Slavonic country. A few who come quickly to mind are Huntley Dupré, Junior Dean of Ohio State College, whose course on the Succession States was undoubtedly added to the curriculum through Mr Dupré's interest in the Slavs, acquired during the years he spent in Prague in student work just after the War. Eric Kelly, Professor of Journalism at Dartmouth, is found giving a course in Slavic Backgrounds, directly as a result of his year in Kraków on a fellowship founded to promote cultural contacts between the United States and the New Poland. Burleigh, one of Professor Kelly's students, teaching drama in the Middle West, must likewise be flavouring his work with a dash of Polish, for he too spent a year in Poland and came back to the Yale School of Drama to produce one of the most significant of modern Polish Plays, Wyspiański's *Wesele*. The ultimate effect of all this infiltration of interest will be measured in the long future by the richness or poverty of American Slavonic studies.

## II

The fertilising effect of war-induced immigration on American studies in the Slavonic field is easier to measure. The first who comes to mind is the late Baron Sergius Korff, a distinguished historian in Russia long before the War. Korff's American career as Professor of East European History, first at Georgetown University (Washington, D.C.), then for a couple of months at Columbia, was cut short by death in 1924, not, however, before he had contributed his study of *Russia's Foreign Relations during the last Half Century* (1922) to the series published by the Institute of Politics (Williams College).

Though Yale cannot be given all the credit for the scholarly contributions of Michael Rostovtsev, since Professor Rostovtsev was at Wisconsin when he published his *Iramans and Greeks in South Russia* (1922), a work on which he had long been engaged, Yale can claim credit for the activities of its research associate, George Vernadsky, who, like Korff and Rostovtsev, was given us

by the War Vernadsky's *History of Russia* (1930), his *Lenin, Red Dictator*, (1931), his *Expansion of Russia* (1933) and his *Political and Diplomatic History of Russia* (1936) are incontrovertible witnesses to the fact that Yale has provided Professor Vernadsky with the leisure and the library for study and that Vernadsky, on his part, has known how to make the most of them. At California George Z. Patrick, another Russian Slavist who came to the United States by way of the War, is indefatigable not only as a translator and interpreter of Russian literature but as a grammarian. The textbooks in Russian which Professor Patrick has prepared, either alone or with his colleagues as collaborators, are important, fundamental groundwork. These texts are Patrick's *Elementary Russian Reader* (1934, with Noyes), his *Advanced Russian Reader* (1937), and his *Elementary Guide to Russian Pronunciation* (1937, again with Noyes).

Nearly every branch of inquiry has led its devotees since the War to Russia or to one of the other Slavonic countries. In education the very audacity of Soviet Russia's widely advertised innovations led George S. Counts of Teachers College, of Columbia University, to Russia in 1930 and out of this visit came in 1931 a study of Russian education entitled *The Soviet Challenge to America*. Years before another educator, Daniel Bell Leary of the University of Buffalo, had learned Russian and written a serious work on *Education and Autocracy in Russia from the Origins to the Bolsheviks* (1919). Out of the fact that students of the drama found their studies vitalised by Russian dramatic literature and Russian stage practice came a demand for critical material on the Russian drama and for translations. The universities helped to satisfy the demand: Professor Noyes of California with translations of Ostrovsky (1917) and in 1933 with *Masterpieces of the Russian Drama*; Professor Wiener with a fine critical account of the *Contemporary Drama of Russia* (1924); Max Mandell helped with a translation of ten plays of Turgenev (1924); Mandell was then teaching Russian at Yale, he had translated Gogol's *Revizor* in 1910; and in 1934 Nikander Strelsky followed with a translation of Alexander Afinogenov's *Fear* for the Vassar College Experimental Theatre. The jolting of economic theory by the Russian experiment led innumerable inquirers to the Slavic world, most of them with a determination to discover in Russia's literature and in her history the origins of the Revolution of 1917. Thus we find Anatole Mazour working on a complete history of the Decembrist Movement, finding this upheaval to be,

as the title of his first volume indicates, *The First Russian Revolution* (1937). We find Harry Hershkovitz looking for *Democratic Ideas in Turgenev's Works* (1932). At the same time J. D. Clarkson's translation of Pokrovsky's *History of Russia* (1931) and Professor Geroid T. Robinson's impressive study of *Rural Russia under the Old Regime* (1932) are two approaches to the same problem,—the sources of 1917.

When the United States attempted to mobilise for war her heterogeneous population, the self-segregated groups of her recent immigrants were found to be so completely unassimilated that leaders of American society, spurred on by a guilty conscience, quickly launched a programme of "Americanisation." Though some of the consequences of this movement were unhappy, others were salutary, since the serious student had a part in it no less than the frequently caricatured and sometimes foolish clubwoman. Studies in the history of Slav groups and their adjustment to American life began to be born in every university. Thus in 1918-1920 came the first part of the imposing work on *The Polish Peasant in America*, by Florian Znaniecki, then in Chicago, now in Poznań, and William I. Thomas (2nd edition published in 1927). In 1922 the Inter-Church World Movement published Paul Fox's *Poles in America*, and Milivoj Stanojević's *Jugoslavs in America* appeared the same year, as did also Davis's *The Russian Immigrant*. In 1926 Elaine Elnett was encouraged by Professor Giddings of Columbia University to study Russian family life as a background for her active work in Civic Education. The fruit of her investigation was an interesting little volume, based entirely on Russian sources, setting forth *The Historic Origin and Social Development of Family Life in Russia*. In the great Polish centre of Buffalo, New York, appeared in 1929 a study sponsored by the University's department of Sociology on *Acculturation in the Polish Group of Buffalo for the two years 1926-1928*. From Columbia's Department of Sociology, again, came in 1933 Robert Kutak's *Story of a Bohemian-American Village* and Jacob Sessler's study of *Communal Pietism among the Early Moravian Americans*.

While the movement of Americanisation was in progress, as well as both before and after, the Public Libraries in all great foreign centres made strenuous efforts to bring the children of foreign-born parents into the sympathetic orbit of the library. In Cleveland, Ohio, a Slavic centre, these efforts, thanks to a great personality, bore more than transient fruit. Eleanor Ledbetter, becoming convinced of the necessity of knowing first how to find

out about the Slavs, prepared a small bibliography of *Polish Literature in English Translation* (1922) which, though long out-dated, is still the most usable thing of its kind in existence.

Mrs Ledbetter's modest work, undertaken purely as a labour of love and with no scholarly purpose, possessed the important virtue of going to the root of Slavic studies. In the basic root-work of bibliography significant contributions have been made by two other Americans, one a university professor, the other, like Mrs. Ledbetter, a librarian: Robert Kerner of the University of California and Avrahm Yarmolinsky, Chief of the Slavonic Division of the New York Public Library. Kerner's *Foundations of Slavic Bibliography* (1916), together with his *Slavic Europe, a Selected Bibliography in the Western European Languages* (1918) are the Slavonic student's primary guide. To these Kerner has added more recently further bibliographical studies, namely, *A Survey of the Resources for Study of the Social Sciences in the Balkans and Turkey* (1930) and *Russian Expansion to America, its Bibliographical Foundations* (1931). Besides his practical bibliographical lists for librarians, without which, college librarians tell me they would be completely at sea in the Slavonic field, Dr. Yarmolinsky has published excellent bibliographical studies in *Early Polish Americana* (1937), a survey of the important Kennan Collection of Russian materials bequeathed in 1920 to the Public Library, and a comprehensive bibliography of *Pushkin in English* (1937). Slavic bibliography is still, however, an under-worked field, so that whoever engages in Slavic research is obliged to be his own bibliographer. This state of affairs led Arthur P. Coleman to prepare a bibliography of Kotzebue translations into Czech as a framework for his *Kotzebue and the Czech Stage* (1936) and to publish this separately in the *Zeitschrift für slavische Philologie* (1934).

### III

Before the War the department of History in an American college or university which offered a specific course in Russian or Balkan history was a rarity. Now we find such courses offered from Boston to California, mostly, however, in the more northerly institutions. In the field of Slavic History Chicago University is the pioneer and Professors Samuel Harper and Ferdinand Schevill the two deans. Professor Harper's work in Russian language and Institutions is of much longer than post-War standing and because of his prestige the history of Russia is recognised

specifically as a field for graduate study. Professor Schevill's work in the field of South Slav history is well known: his *History of the Balkan Peninsula* (1922 and 1933) is a standard work on the subject. Other colleges and universities which offer courses in Russian History are Boston University (with Professor Frank Nowak, who calls his course History of Russia and Poland); California (Kerner), Columbia (Robinson), Cornell (Mosely); Georgetown (a five-year cycle in the Russian Revolution given by Professor Edmund Walsh); Harvard (Karpovich); Illinois (Rodkey); Miami (in Oxford, Ohio, with Harry N. Howard, evidently one of Kerner's students); Michigan (Stanton); New York University (Alexander Baltzly); Smith (Walter C. Barnes); Stanford (Fisher), Vassar (Textor); Yale (Vernadsky). This list is representative rather than exhaustive.<sup>2</sup> Most of the institutions named above offer courses also in the history of the Balkans and the Near East (not so, however, Columbia), and these are taught, in nearly every instance, by the man who teaches Russian history, though Stanford has a special teacher (David Harris) for the Balkans. Generally speaking, the man has made his post in this pioneer field; he has grown out of a more general interest into specifically Slavonic, and he has enough prestige to warrant the establishment of a course or two. This is clearly seen in the case of American University in Washington, D.C., where Professor Wesley M. Gewehr offers a course in Balkan History that deals with "the coming of the Slavs, the rise and disruption of the Turkish Empire, the development of the modern Balkans, etc.", though no course in Russian History as such appears in the catalogue. Professor Gewehr is a product of Schevill's seminar at Chicago; it was he who assisted in the revision of Schevill's *History of the Balkans* in 1933, and he has carried his special interest to the university where he is teaching.

Strange paradoxes turn up as one studies college catalogues in search of courses in Slavonic history; for one thing, the importance of the pressure of local groups looms large. At Wisconsin, for example, where German studies are strong and several specialised courses in German history are offered, where, moreover, it is possible to do the most advanced graduate work in Polish under Professor Birkenmajer, there is not a single course in Russian or Balkan history. At Nebraska and Texas, where Czech language

<sup>2</sup> For exhaustive surveys of this field, the reader is advised to consult the lists prepared from time to time by Arthur I. Andrews for the *Slavonic and East European Review*.

and literature are taught (Miček of Texas devotes a whole course to Karel Čapek and Štěpánek is at Nebraska), there is likewise no course in Russian or South Slav history. At the University of Washington, where, in deference to a large Scandinavian population, Scandinavian studies are strong, nothing is done with either Russian language or history, although the Soviet Union is geographically closer to that State than to any other.

Another paradox is seen in the case of Pennsylvania State College, where no special work is offered in any branch of Slavonics, yet from whose history department came in 1935 Professor Francis J. Tschan's valuable contribution to Slavonic studies in the form of his translation, with critical comment, of Helmold's *Chronicle of the Slavs*. This work and Professor Cross's translation of the *Russian Primary Chronicle* (1930) together make up the more recent contribution of American scholars to the translation of medieval manuscripts pertaining to the Slavs.

In most universities where Russian history is taught such a course is undergirded by adequate courses in the Russian language. At Cornell, however, where Professor Philip E. Mosely, author of *Russian Diplomacy and the Opening of the Eastern Question in 1838-1839* (1934), teaches both Russian History and Balkan, there is no sign of any language course to support either. The same is true of Boston University, but there the need is not identical, since in a cosmopolitan city like Boston Russian lessons are easier to come by than in the quiet, hill-top village of Ithaca. At Vassar College where Lucy Textor, author of a study of *Land Reform in Czechoslovakia* (1923), gives courses in Russian and Central-South European History, Russian is competently taught by Nikander Strelsky. At Smith Russian was taught during the two academic years 1932-3 and 1933-4, then dropped. Since serious study of a Slavonic problem is impossible without knowledge of one or more Slavonic tongues, it is safe to conjecture that important scholarly contributions in the Slavonic field are likely to come from the institutions which emphasise the language. At the same time there are many Americans who require no lessons in a Slavonic tongue since they are themselves of Slavonic origin. It is earnestly to be hoped that these will in increasing numbers follow in the footsteps of Professors Nowak of Boston and Kerner of California and devote themselves to a field in which they were born with the tremendous advantage of linguistic equipment. Paul Fox did this at Johns Hopkins when he wrote his dissertation on the economic and social aspects of *The Reformation in Poland* (1924); William

Tonesk is doing it in his study of Karel Čapek; F. J. Vondraček did it when he investigated *The Foreign Policy of Czechoslovakia, 1918-1935* (1937).

The creation of courses in Russian and Balkan history noted above entailed the writing of new textbooks. The Berkshire Historical Series, edited by Prof. Richard Newhall of Williams College, attempted to meet the new need. Among its already published twenty-eight volumes are four works concerned specifically with the Slavs, Frank Nowak's *Medieval Slavdom and the Rise of Russia* (1930), Wesley M. Gewehr's *Rise of Nationalism in the Balkans* (1931), Michael Karpovich's *Imperial Russia* (1932), and Vernadsky's *The Russian Revolution* (1932).

#### IV

With Czech and Polish and even, intermittently, Serbo-Croatian appearing in several new college and university curricula after the War, textbooks in these languages had to be written. In Czech the need was actually anticipated by J. V. Nigrin, a Milwaukee (Wisconsin) high school teacher, with a text called *Bohemian Made Easy* (1918). Later Orin Štěpánek of the University of Nebraska brought out a *Simplified Czechoslovak Grammar and Conversation Book* (1930), and three years later he recast this text as a *Czech Grammar* (1933). Then in 1936, in *Progressive Czech*, B. E. Mikula, another high school teacher, tried to apply the same animated methods to the teaching of Czech as are employed in American schools in other languages, thus bringing the total of Czech language texts since the War to four. The Slovak struggle for autonomy, strong in the United States, brought forth in 1935 P. A. Hrobak's *Slovak Lessons*, a text likely to be used mostly in church schools. The long recognised need for a reliable Polish language text threatens at last to be amusingly oversatisfied. With the introduction of Polish into high schools in such strong Polish centres as Chicago, Detroit, Milwaukee, Bridgeport (Conn.), Chicopee (Mass.) and others, everyone in the United States who is teaching Polish appears to be writing a textbook. Besides the three or four that are still only rumours, three have actually appeared: Paul Fox's *Essentials of Polish* (1936),—Fox for a while gave Extension Courses in Polish at Northwestern University, Sister Mary Vlodimira's *First Polish Lessons* (1937), Marie Paryski's *Practical Polish Grammar* (1938), and J. E. Bolanowski's *New Polish Grammar* (1938). A contribution to methods of teaching Polish was made in 1936 by Adriana C. Gutowska of Columbia University, with her *Tentative Syllabus*



*for the Teaching of Polish in High Schools.* In the field of Serbo-Croatian there has been no such popular demand for a text as in Polish. At the same time, Professor John Dyneley Prince was moved, through his deep affection for the Serbian people, to write a *Serbo-Croatian Grammar* (1929) during the period of his residence in Belgrade as United States Minister in Yugoslavia.

Though the Russian language was no newcomer to the university curriculum twenty years ago, the newly stimulated interest in it at that time was partly responsible for the appearance of two Russian language texts, both in 1919, Professor Edward Prokosch's *Elementary Russian Grammar* and Professor Prince's *Grammar for Class and Reference Use*.

Practical language instruction in the Slavonic tongues has had a chequered history in American universities. At Harvard Russian has been offered without interruption since 1896; at California under Noyes since 1907; at Michigan, with C. L. Meader of the department of General Language in charge, since 1908; at Columbia since 1914; and at Chicago it has long been taught under Professor Harper. At Yale, however, where Russian courses were offered for twenty years, they were suddenly dropped in the twenties at the moment when interest in things Russian was almost a fad. At Dartmouth Isabel Hapgood once taught Russian, at first to large classes; later, however, her classes dwindled and finally instruction in Russian language was taken over by the department of German under Professor Raymond Jones. Now Dartmouth offers no Russian, though it is said Professor Kelly will guide the student who really wishes to learn it.

With Polish it has been the same. At Columbia Polish has been taught without a break since 1918, at first by Mr. L. K. Straszewicz, then by Dr. Morawski-Nawench, since 1928 under Arthur P. Coleman, with the assistance in Extension Courses since 1934, of the Rev. Stanisław Sobieniowski, a graduate of the Jagiellonian University. At Michigan, however, Polish courses, ably conducted from 1927-1930 by Tadeusz Mitana, were abandoned; and in 1937 we find Professor Mitana offering two courses in Polish language and one in literature at Northwestern University. At Wisconsin Polish studies appeared in Extension in 1932 under Dr. Marie Królówna of the Jagiellonian University. The enrollment in Dr. Królówna's classes, large at first, soon declined, and in 1934 the decline was so great that Dr. Królówna herself migrated to Duquesne University (Pittsburgh, Pa.) to establish Polish courses there. Unwilling to allow Polish to be abandoned at Wisconsin,

the Polish National Alliance stepped in with a subsidy, and Szymon Deptuła was engaged as teacher. Out of this difficult beginning has come, it now appears, a solid department of Polish at this strategically-placed university. In the academic year 1936-1937 a Chair of Polish was created, and Professor Witold Doroszewski of the University of Warsaw was invited to occupy it. During his year in the United States Professor Doroszewski employed his time to good advantage, compiling a study of the Polish spoken by Americans of Polish origin. Now Polish at Wisconsin is in charge of Professor Józef Birkenmajer, a veteran translator of English works and a prolific writer. Polish studies in this Middle Western centre seem at last likely to produce serious contributions.

Czech studies have been strongest, as we have seen, in Nebraska and Texas. They have flourished also in church schools, notably the College of St. Procopius in Lisle, Illinois. At Columbia, where for most of the time since the War Czech, and for a while Slovak, language courses were offered, these, along with a pioneer course in Ukrainian language, were cancelled in the spring of 1938, though Survey of the culture of the Czechs and Slovaks is still offered.

For the reasons given above, we are bound to hold in abeyance our judgment of newly-introduced courses in Slavonic language: we must wait and see how long they endure and, what is most important, what fruit they bear.

## V

There are four universities in the United States with regularly constituted Slovak departments: Harvard and Columbia, California and Stanford, two on the eastern coast, two on the west. At Harvard, under Professor Samuel Cross, a medievalist whose special interest is Russian history up to the Tartar invasion, the department's most honoured son is Ernest J. Simmons, a young scholar who, approaching Slavonics from the starting-point of interest in Anglo-Russian cultural relations, came eventually to specialise in Pushkin. Through Simmons, Harvard made perhaps the most important single American contribution to the Pushkin Centenary with *Pushkin*, a full-length biography of the poet. Through the editorial enterprise of Professor Cross, moreover, Harvard contributed to the centenary a volume of *Centennial Essays for Pushkin* (1937), to which a representative group of American Slavonic scholars and enthusiasts contributed.

At Columbia University a Slavonic Department was organised in 1915 through the energy of Professor John Dyneley Prince,

whose interest had widened from Semitics, his original speciality, to embrace Slavonics. In 1922 Professor Prince was called to Europe to represent the United States as Minister to Denmark, later to Yugoslavia, yet he continued to contribute scholarly articles to learned journals. Most of these revolved around the borrowings of one language from another, Serbo-Croatian from Turkish, Hungarian from Slavonic, and the like. A volume of selected reprints of Professor Prince's articles, together with a complete list of the titles of his papers, will shortly be published by the Columbia University Press.

To Professor Clarence A. Manning fell the task of nurturing Slavonic work at Columbia during the absence of Professor Prince. Besides administering the growing department, with its numerous extension courses in the various languages, Manning guided the work of advanced students and carried on at the same time scholarly undertakings of his own. One of the most interesting works produced by the department under Manning's guidance was Nina Toumanova's life of *Anton Chekhov* (1937). The inquiries of the department have ranged over a wide field: from Eugene Moskov's study of Chaadayev (1937) Coleman's study of *Humor in the Russian Comedy* (1925), Stanoyevic's *Early Yugoslav Literature* (1922), and Sharenkov's *Manichæism in Bulgaria* (1927), to a series of studies of the various types that appear in Russian literature, beginning with Joshua Kunitz's study of the Jew (1929), Louis Perlmann's of the business man (1937), and Nikander Strelesky's (being written) of the land-owning class.

Professor Manning's own writings in the field of Slavonics have been varied. He has translated Korolenko's *Birds of Heaven* (1919), A. K. Tolstoy's *Prince Serebryany* (1927), and Shishmanov's *History of Bulgarian Literature* (1932), besides numerous fragmentary works. He has edited an *Anthology of Czechoslovak Poetry* (1929), retold the story of *Marko, the King's Son* (1932) and written a score of articles on various phases of past as well as current Slavic literature. He has, moreover, made more specialised studies of Dostoyevsky.

Since 1928 Arthur P. Coleman has been in charge of Polish work at Columbia and this has gradually expanded to engage much of his time. Coleman's work has been in several fields: research on Kotzebue, for the purpose of determining and appraising his influence on the various Slavonic literatures; the reviewing of current Polish literary contributions to produce, eventually, a handbook in English, on this subject; the writing of a history of American Slavonic studies; translation, with Mrs. Coleman, of

Polish literary works (Malczewski's *Marya*, in verse, 1934, Słowacki's *Marya Stuart*, 1937). Along with Mieczysław Haiman, Custodian of the Polish Museum in Chicago, Coleman is interested in American opinion of the Slavs and in this field produced *The Polish Insurrection of 1863 in the Light of New York Editorial Opinion* (1934).

The work of California's Slavic Department has already been referred to more than once. Its fruits have been consistent, remarkable and varied, virtually ranging over the whole field of Slavonics. When the War began to vitalise Russian and other Slavic studies in 1916, Professor Noyes, at that time in sole charge of the work, was obliged to have an assistant. It was then, in 1917, that Alexander Kaun came to the department. Kaun's most notable contributions have been in the field of Russian literature, his most extensive works being his critical study of *Leonid Andreyev* (1924) and a full-length biography of Maxim Gorky (*Maxim Gorky and his Russia*) (1931). Kaun has written other literary studies (of Ivan Bunin, for example) and he has translated not only several modern Russian plays (for the *Masterpieces of Russian Drama* edited by Noyes) but also Kormilov's *Modern Russian History* (1924). In 1934 Kaun entered the textbook field with a *First Russian Reader*. Professor Patrick, who came to California from Russia in 1920, at first as associate in French as well as Russian, has gradually made a large place for himself in the preparation of textbooks, previously noted. Like his colleague Professor Kaun, Patrick has taken a hand in translating, having contributed also to the volume of Russian drama and having collaborated in 1937 in Dorothea Radin's translation of *Eugene Onegin*.

Professor Noyes came to Slavonic work from the English department at Harvard, where he specialised in Dryden. Having studied two years in Russia, he went as far from his Alma Mater in the United States as possible to found, not an English department but a Slavic. His chief interest was at first Tolstoy, as Professor Wiener's had been, and to his mastery of the great Russian's art and personality his critical biography (1918) stands as a monument. Noyes was never, however, exclusively a Russian scholar, as his publications quickly proved. For in 1917, while materials for his studies of Tolstoy were accumulating, he published a prose translation of the Polish epic, *Pan Tadeusz*. This was the forerunner of so long a list of translations, not only from Polish but from other Slav tongues as well, that it constitutes of itself a whole chapter in the history of American Slavic studies. What is most remarkable about Professor Noyes is the quality of the

builder which he possesses : he is indeed an educator, a bringer-out of personalities. In recent years nearly all his energy has been expended in the direction of translating, with a host of students and other admirers, works which these persons would never have dreamed of being able to attempt by themselves. Each one he has disciplined severely, particularly as regards English style. Not only in Russian and Polish but even in Slovene Noyes has done work, assisting Anthony Klančar to polish, then publish, several poems from the Slovene. The most important recent contribution from Professor Noyes' department in the field of translation is Dorothea Radin's translation of *Eugene Onegin* (1937).

The University of California is rich in Slavonic specialists. In its history department Professor Kerner continues by his own example to encourage studies in Slavic history. Thus in 1932 came his work on *Bohemia in the 18th Century*, a study of the critical times of Joseph II, and in 1936 *The Balkan Conferences and the Balkan Entente, 1930-1935*, an investigation of a field in which Kerner had been interested since 1918 when he contributed the chapter on "The Yugoslav Movement" to a comprehensive volume on *The Russian Revolution* published by the Harvard Press.

At Stanford, as at California, the work of the Slavic Department, with Henry Lanz in charge, can hardly be considered independently of that being accomplished in the history department in connection with the Hoover War Library. The two supplement each other, so that Stanford rivals Harvard, Columbia and California as a centre of Slavonic work. As at the other three universities, so at Stanford, full graduate work in any branch of Slavics is possible, though courses in the minor tongues are given only when there is a genuine demand. Here, thanks to the considerable Czech population, Czech is the language emphasised next to Russian, as at Columbia and California Polish comes second. At Stanford, too, as at California and Columbia, certain courses in Russian literature are open to those who know no Russian, yet are interested in Russian literature for cultural reasons. At Stanford as at Columbia a course is offered in the cultural history of the non-Russian Slavic groups, with Lanz giving it at Stanford, Coleman at Columbia. At Stanford, too, short courses on Tolstoy, Dostoyevsky and Turgenev are offered, though none, so far as we can judge, as at Harvard on Pushkin. When we turn to the Stanford group which has published material based on the War Library collections, we find others besides Professor Fisher, mentioned above. There is Lincoln Hutchinson, whose work on the Russian

famine appeared in 1927 (written with Golder's help); he published in 1931 an edition of Breshkovskaya's memoirs, and in the same year, edited with Carl C. Plehn, Gregory Sokolnikov's *Soviet Policy in Public Finance*, 1917-1928. Others who have worked in the same field are Sidney Brooks and James T. Bunyan; Bunyan's critical edition of documents pertaining to *Intervention, Civil War and Communism in Russia, April-December*, 1918, was published in 1936 as a sequel to his *Bolshevik Revolution*, 1917-1918, which appeared in 1934.

Though up to the present no startling results have been produced in the United States in the field of Slavonic linguistics, this branch has by no means been neglected. At Stanford under Lanz, at California under Noyes, at Harvard under Cross and at Wisconsin under Senn, who has just gone to the University of Pennsylvania, courses in Church Slavic have long been a regular part of the curriculum. At Yale the late Edward Prokosch, who at one time taught Russian at Wisconsin, was in charge of the work in Church Slavic. His death in the summer of 1938 carried off one of the most distinguished of American linguistic scholars.

## VI

The Great War, as we have said, fertilised American Slavonic studies in three ways. In still a fourth way it exerted an influence, subtle but real. To the Slavs in America, as to the Slavs in Europe, it gave a sense of racial and national pride. To the American children of Slavic parents this pride of ancestry was communicated, and those children are beginning now to show a mass interest in the culture of their ancestors, where before the War it was only the rare and independent individual who found his Slavic heritage interesting. This upsurge of interest is directly responsible for Wisconsin's progress in Polish studies. To it also is attributable Notre Dame's establishment of Polish work in 1936. Whether this sentiment is strong enough to keep such work going permanently and, most important of all, to elevate its quality to the level of French and German studies, is still a question. The manner in which Notre Dame set about introducing Polish seems to augur well for its permanence at that institution at any rate, since Father Stanisław Lisewski was allowed a two-year's period of preparation in Poland before a single course was offered; and the work has expanded in a natural manner until now it has reached out into the general Slavonic field, with a survey course covering the whole field of Slavonic literature.

As this article is being written, Slavonic Europe begins to seethe again as it did twenty years ago when our chronicle began; and recent events are focussing interest once more on the Slavonic world. At the same time America's twenty million young people of Slavonic origin are discovering that by neglecting, often disparaging, their racial heritage, they have, in very truth, sold their birthright for a mess of pottage. It is impossible to predict in what manner Slavonic studies in the United States will be affected by the new order in Europe: it is safe to say only that in some manner they are bound to be affected by it.

*Columbia University.*

A. P. COLEMAN.

## ANGLO-SOVIET RELATIONS DURING LABOUR'S FIRST MINISTRY (1924)

UNTIL 1 February, 1924, the Soviet policy of the British Foreign Office was founded on the belief shared by the Allies in the ultimate success of diplomatic efforts to isolate the Soviet Union. The existing relationship between the two countries, an outgrowth of the Trade Agreement of 1921, implied *de facto* recognition of the Soviet régime; but the political situation, far from experiencing any appreciable betterment, was actually fraught with increasing hazards to peace. Although the first period of militant communism had come to an end in 1921, outstanding diplomatic differences remained as a focal point of irritation. The Genoa Conference of 1922 showed that the Soviet Government was unwilling to settle for the Tsarist debts without a corresponding indemnity for the damages alleged to have been incurred by British intervention during the civil war, large credits for trade, and *de jure* recognition. In the Near and Middle East Soviet collaboration with Turkey, Afghanistan, and Persia threatened to have colonial repercussions dangerous to the safety of the British Empire. Following the sensational Moscow trials in 1923 of a number of Polish Roman Catholic priests for alleged treasonable activities and their severe sentences, Lord Curzon precipitated a new crisis by his "ultimatum" to the Soviet State, which was regarded throughout Europe as a threat of war. Curzon's sharp protest against the death sentence of Monsignor Budkiewicz was insultingly received by the Russians, and the British Foreign Secretary sought to make the incident an occasion for a general reckoning on the anti-British activities of the Soviet Union in the Middle East. Fortunately both countries were unprepared for an immediate conflict because of various domestic and diplomatic factors, and the war clouds passed.<sup>1</sup>

The intolerable nature of Anglo-Soviet diplomatic intercourse under the *de facto* arrangement became patent to many during the Curzon crisis. Krasin, the Soviet diplomat, in a reply to Curzon, pointed out that the latter's terms would have been arrived at with much less delay under normal diplomatic relations and negotiations. He expressed the wish of his government that

<sup>1</sup> The Earl of Ronaldshay, *Life of Lord Curzon* (London, 1928), III, 354-6; Bernard Pares, *My Russian Memoirs* (London, 1931), 591-3. For the official text of the Anglo-Soviet Trade Agreement of 1921 see *The League of Nations Treaty Series*, 1921, IV, 127-136 and *British State Papers* (Accounts and Papers), 1921, XLIII, Cmd. 1207.



Britain would take the necessary steps to consolidate economic and political relations between the two countries.<sup>2</sup> Labour Members in Parliament attacked the Speech from the Throne of January 1924 as unrealistic on Soviet affairs.<sup>3</sup> Great stress was laid by Labour upon Russian trade possibilities as a partial solution of the British unemployment problem. The trade bait held out by the Soviet Union, anxious to stabilise its international position, produced a veritable orgy of articles and statistics upon the mutual benefits to be derived from more intimate trade relations.<sup>4</sup>

In the general elections of 1924, the electorate refused to endorse Mr. Baldwin's protectionism and deprived the Conservatives of their majority. The distribution of seats was: Conservatives 258, Labour 191, Liberals 158, and Independants 8.<sup>5</sup> The Liberals now held the balance of power between the Conservatives and Labour, who maintained divergent theories concerning relations with the Soviet Union. At the National Liberal Club, Asquith, Lloyd George, and Sir John Simon agreed to support a Labour Ministry "for a few months at any rate, because there was no practical alternative for the moment." But Labour, they declared, "must behave itself."<sup>6</sup>

Under these conditions, Labour's hope of fulfilling its Russian policy was over-optimistic. The Party seemed to many Conservatives to be a mask for the hated Bolsheviks. Press hostility and a sinking stock market ushered in the new régime. On the credit side, Labour was able to claim a popular leader, Mr. Ramsay MacDonald, then at the height of his personal influence. By word and deed he had championed the idea of Anglo-Soviet conciliation, and had on numerous occasions attacked British intervention in Russia. Several years previously, he had even written enthusiastically that,

"Labour is drawn to Lenin, not because it associates itself with all that Lenin does or stands for, but because he is fighting

<sup>2</sup> *British State Papers*, 1927, XXVI, Cmd. 2895, No. 6.

<sup>3</sup> *Hansard*, Fifth Series, CLXIX, 158.

<sup>4</sup> Louis Fischer, *The Soviets in World Affairs*, II, 466, A. A. Santalov and L. Segal (ed.), *The Soviet Union Year Book* (London, 1928), 68; Editorial, "Economic Revival in Russia," *The Nation* (London), 6 February, 1924, *Ministry of Labour Gazette*, XXXII, Nos. 1-11; The Board of Trade, *Statistical Abstract for the United Kingdom*, 74th No., 99, 318-9, 322-3; *Hansard*, CLXIX, 1508.

<sup>5</sup> G. D. H. Cole, "The British Labour Movement," *Labour Research Department Pamphlets* (London, 1925), 20.

<sup>6</sup> The Earl of Oxford and Asquith, *Memories and Reflections* (Boston, 1928), 249.

its battle, and because it is not deeply influenced by the accusations of tyranny . . . The Russian Revolution has been one of the greatest events in the history of the world, and the attacks that have been made upon it should rally to its defence everyone who cares for political liberty and freedom of thought."<sup>7</sup>

At the Victory Demonstration of the Labour Party at the Albert Hall in London, MacDonald declared

"The pompous folly of standing aloof from the Russian Government will be ended. Ended, not because we agree with what the Russian Government has done—that is not our business. . . . I want trade; I want negotiations; I want a settlement from the coasts of Japan to the coasts of Ireland. If I have to protest against what is being done in Afghanistan, how can I protest unless I have channels to use for my protest?"<sup>8</sup>

At the first meeting of the Labour Cabinet, a vote was taken to fulfil the Party pledge of Russian recognition. The British agent in Moscow, Sir R. M. Hodgson, was instructed to present an official declaration to the Soviet Minister, Chicherin. By this arrangement the Soviet Government was recognised *de jure*, diplomatic relations were to be resumed, Communist propaganda against Britain to cease, and an invitation extended to Russia for a conference upon outstanding differences.<sup>9</sup>

The Union Congress, then in session, warmly welcomed the recognition note as a friendly gesture of British Labour and recalled the latter's persistent attempts to end the interventionist policy adopted by the early post-war Ministries. Kalinin, President of the Congress, declared that a basis for close future collaboration had been laid.<sup>10</sup> All Moscow was placarded with these announcements.<sup>11</sup> Subsequently on February 8, the official reply from the Russian Foreign office was sent, over the signature of Rakovsky, accepting all the points listed in the British note.<sup>12</sup>

Owing to the Soviet promise to give unusual concessions to the first nation which granted *de jure* recognition to the Soviets, there

<sup>7</sup> J. Ramsay MacDonald, *Parliament and Revolution* (New York, 1920), 21.

<sup>8</sup> H. Hessel Tiltman, *J. Ramsay MacDonald* (New York, 1929), Appendix G.

<sup>9</sup> "Text of Hodgson Note," *Russian Review*, 1 April, 1924.

<sup>10</sup> *Nation* (London), 12 March, 1924.

<sup>11</sup> *The Times*, 4 February, 1924.

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid*, 9 February, 1924.

had actually been a race for the concessions between Mussolini and MacDonald. Both claimed to have acted at the same time. Overnight Russia's diplomatic isolation in Western Europe and elsewhere was ended, as the British lead was accepted by ten other nations which granted *de jure* recognition before the end of October, 1924.<sup>13</sup> France, for example, which had followed her nationalists in boycotting Russia, now sensed the new diplomatic trend and prepared to obtain any advantages gained by England.<sup>14</sup>

In Parliament, MacDonald announced the forthcoming Anglo-Soviet Conference upon the outstanding claims of both nations. He declared his hope that Russia would ultimately join the League of Nations and be admitted to active co-operation in the affairs of the world.<sup>15</sup> Both Lord Curzon and Baldwin attacked the Government for not having demanded conditions before recognition was granted. Any debt concession to Russia, they felt, would be a dangerous precedent for other debtors in Europe. Finally, argued Baldwin, the Soviet Union was too vague territorially for adequate treaty arrangements. Lord Emmott led the attack on Russian rapprochement and quoted the insulting comments in the Soviet press, particularly the speeches of Zinoviev, Chairman of the Communist International, on the British claims for Tsarist debts.<sup>16</sup>

Within the Soviet Union, despite an appearance of unity, rival philosophies were at work. The Zinoviev speech which Emmott had quoted was not unique in its irreconcilable attitude. Trotsky's followers under the banner of world revolution spurned collaboration.<sup>17</sup> Litvinov, acting Commissary for Foreign Affairs, rejoiced that London might become the centre of a new World Revolution.<sup>18</sup> Others like Krasin and Chicherin were lukewarm.<sup>19</sup> But the choice of such diplomats as Rakovsky and other members of the Russian delegation who were eager for an agreement, reflects the existence of a more collaborationist philosophy, which was eventually to emerge clearly as Stalinism.

<sup>13</sup> These nations were: Italy (7 February), Norway (13 February), Austria (20 February), Greece (8 March), Danzig (13 March), Sweden (15 March), China (31 May), Denmark (18 June), Mexico (4 August), and France (28 October), *Soviet Union Year Book* (1928), 32.

<sup>14</sup> *Le Temps*, 3 February; *The Times*, 3 February.

<sup>15</sup> *Hansard*, Fifth Series, CXLIX, 768.

<sup>16</sup> *Ibid.*, Lords, LVI, 1039-1051.

<sup>17</sup> Leon Trotsky, *Whither England* (New York, 1925), *passim*.

<sup>18</sup> *Russian Review*, 15 February, 1924.

<sup>19</sup> G. Chicherin, "Soviet Diplomacy Since the War," *Living Age*, 22 March, 1924; *Russian Information and Review*, 16 February, 1924.

As the Conference prepared to open on 15 April, various attempts were made to clarify the nature of the agenda. The Association of British Creditors of Russia, representing British traders, mine-owners, factory owners, and private investors in Russian securities, passed several resolutions demanding restitution for losses, and that any question of trade resumption must be based on the satisfaction of these claims.<sup>20</sup> A similar statement was issued by the Federation of British Industries.<sup>21</sup> In the House of Commons, MacDonald, in reply to a question, outlined his plans for the Conference:

"The question of credits would be proposed by the Russian Government and not by us, but I have no intention of going any further, as far as government credit is concerned, than overseas credit, trade facilities credit, and such things as have already in principle been approved regarding other countries by the House of Commons."<sup>22</sup>

The Russian proposals for the Conference agenda were not clear until the first session. Previously, Rakovsky, the Soviet envoy, had published an article in the English Press upon the mutual benefits of trade resumption with Russia.<sup>23</sup> He showed that the British share of Russian exports had risen from 23 per cent. of the total during pre-war times to 33 per cent. of the post-war total, a similar rise was experienced in the share of Russian imports. Large orders for British goods could be expected for the needs of the Russian cotton and woollen industries, the electrical industry, railways, the restoration of the Russian fleet, and other governmental projects. To pay for this however, he wrote, the revenue derived from Russian exports would not suffice, and a loan would be necessary as well as complete credit facilities. The question of a loan and large credits was a pivotal one in the ensuing negotiations.

In his address of welcome to the Russian delegation, MacDonald stressed his unqualified recognition of the Soviets and his sincere desire to co-operate with the Russians. He outlined the agenda as including mutual claims, the cessation of propaganda, and a review of former treaties.<sup>24</sup> Rakovsky's reply was cordial, but envisaged a much more ambitious programme. He declared that Russia's needs

<sup>20</sup> *The Times*, 9 February, 1924.

<sup>21</sup> *Ibid*

<sup>22</sup> *Hansard*, Fifth Series, CXLIX, 769

<sup>23</sup> C. Rakovsky, "Anglo-Russian Trade Co-operation," *The Labour Magazine*, March, 1924.

<sup>24</sup> George Glasgow, "The Anglo-Russ Conference," *Contemporary Review*, April, 1924.

required large credits and that the scope of the Conference should include Asiatic affairs, disarmament, a revision of the Treaty of Versailles, and the reopening of the Bessarabian question.<sup>25</sup> The Russian agenda, however, was rejected in favour of the British.

Hardly had the Conference opened before it was embarrassed by the so-called Bankers' Memorandum. The signatories of the Memorandum included the Big Five joint-stock companies in England which had almost a decisive voice on the question of credits. Other leading bankers of the City completed the list. They demanded that Russia pay her public and private debts, that an equitable restitution of private property to foreigners be made; that a special extra-territorial system of courts be set up to guarantee the sanctity of contracts, that British bankers, industrialists, and traders be given complete freedom in dealing with similar private agencies in Russia; and that the Bolsheviks abandon their propaganda.<sup>26</sup> Aid to Russia was based upon the retention of a considerable portion of her trade in private rather than in governmental channels.

The Memorandum embarrassed both groups of negotiators. Russia was called upon to make drastic changes in her domestic policies almost to the point of abolishing her chosen form of government. The governmental monopoly of foreign trade was a fixed principle in Communist teachings. Rakovsky endeavoured to support the Soviet position by emphasising the reciprocal advantages to be derived from a treaty; special concessions of value could be given to former property owners to compensate them for nationalisation. But to the demand for the cessation of the government monopoly of trade, he replied, "Never."<sup>27</sup> Upon this basis the Conference agreed to act and set itself to work, hoping to win over financial backing ultimately.

Most of the detailed work in connection with the negotiations was done by committees. Some of the problems such as those studied by the group on former treaties were relatively simple, since economic and geographic changes had made many of the Tsarist treaties inapplicable.<sup>28</sup> The Claims Committee faced by far the chief problems of the Conference. Russia's official pre-war indebtedness to England was £26,000,000; the war loans amounted to £650,000,000; the municipal issues to £14,000,000; and the private obligations were estimated at £350,000,000. Altogether Russia's debt to

<sup>25</sup> *Ibid.*, also *The Times*, 15 April.

<sup>26</sup> *Contemporary Review*, April, 1924.

<sup>27</sup> *The Times*, 26 April.

<sup>28</sup> Editorial, "Anglo-Soviet Conference," *Saturday Review*, 10 May, 1924.

England appeared to be £1,040,000,000.<sup>29</sup> Many of the items were exaggerated claims. Some of the Tsarist expenditures were incurred in suppressing democratic reform—an item emphatically repudiated by the Soviet régime. The war debt included charges for war munitions never delivered, due to the cessation of the war and Allied intervention in Russia.

Rakovsky demanded credit for the Russian gold deposited in British Banks during the war. His country, he complained, had fought for three years without obtaining any reward at Versailles, losing more men than any ally, and losing territory while all the allies had gained. He wished that Russian counter-claims for interventionist damages be recognised as partly cancellative, at least, of British debts. For this claim he cited the Alabama Decision of 1871, which had awarded the United States damages for British intervention in the American Civil War.<sup>30</sup> He was willing to acknowledge obligations to private investors, especially small bondholders, if the British government would guarantee the interest on a loan of £30,000,000 on the British Stock Exchange.

Sir Arthur Ponsonby, who with MacDonald helped in directing the British case at the Conference, feared that any scaling of debts would bring a similar claim from French and Italian debtors and succeeded in shelving the question of Soviet counter-claims. Concessions to British industrialists were tentatively arranged. The question of credits was believed soluble under the Trade Facilities Act and other commercial measures in operation. But the stumbling block proved to be the matter of granting a government guarantee of a Russian loan. MacDonald had pledged his word to Parliament that a loan would not be considered, and the Press was vehemently opposed to such an arrangement.<sup>31</sup> *The Times*, particularly, flayed the Soviet proposals.<sup>32</sup>

MacDonald tried to show the Russians that the City would not be any more favourable to a loan guarantee than the Labour Government appeared to be. Twice Rakovsky was referred to the financiers, who made it clear that Russia's unqualified payment of past obligations would be the only basis for future loans.<sup>33</sup> During the critical week of 20–27 May, it seemed as if the Conference would break up over the question of a loan. Ponsonby warned the

<sup>29</sup> George Glasgow, *MacDonald as Diplomatist* (London, 1924), 93.

<sup>30</sup> R. Page Arnot, *Soviet Russia and Her Neighbours*, 76–7.

<sup>31</sup> Glasgow, *MacDonald as Diplomatist*, 93.

<sup>32</sup> *The Times*, 14–15 April.

<sup>33</sup> Glasgow, "Anglo-Russ Conference," *Contemporary Review*, July, 1924.

Russians that the Government possessed no majority and hence could not carry through any special or extravagant measures <sup>34</sup>

In an effort to save the situation, the brilliant Russian diplomat, Litvinov, came to London on 7 June in time to renew the negotiations, which had been halted by the deadlock. Rakovsky took this opportunity to confer directly with the British bondholders effected by Russian expropriation decrees at the Foreign Office, but no common arrangement could be made.<sup>35</sup> Subsequently it was decided by the two governments that whenever an agreement should be reached with at least half the claimants, the British Government would regard the settlement as binding upon the remaining claimants. Russia then agreed to pay Britain a lump sum for distribution among the claimants. The question of a loan guarantee was carefully avoided and finally deferred to a future treaty. In spite of this mutually temporising attitude, the Conference struck on another snag in the matter of compensation for expropriated property and the selection as to who was to decide upon the validity of the Russian debts.<sup>36</sup> A continuous seventeen-hour session on 4-5 August ended in a new deadlock. Only through a last-minute compromise arranged by certain influential Labour Members was the Conference saved. The British Government won the right to control the distribution of the Russian payments.

The commercial treaty had been concluded earlier in the Conference.<sup>37</sup> Special privileges were given by each to the nationals of the other in respect to emigration, communication, military service, taxes, trade facilities, and transportation. Extra-territorial immunity was granted to the offices of the trade delegations. Besides the chief points of the General Treaty which have already been considered, there was a fisheries settlement providing for a three-mile limit in Russian territorial waters, with certain protective measures for the Murmansk fisheries. The question of counter-claims for interventionist destruction during the civil war was reserved for future discussions, together with the debts of the Tsarist and Provisional Governments. Only when the treaty should be completed regarding counter-claims and pre-Soviet British debts as a unit, would England recommend to Parliament a guarantee of the interest and sinking fund of a loan to be issued by the USSR.

<sup>34</sup> Fischer, *The Soviets in World Affairs*, II, 483.

<sup>35</sup> Glasgow, "Rakovsky's Press Statement," *Contemporary Review*, June, 1924.

<sup>36</sup> *Manchester Guardian*, 8 August, 1924.

<sup>37</sup> Official text in *British State Papers*, 1924, XXVI, Cmd. 2215-6.

The treaties were signed on 10 August by MacDonald and Ponsonby for England and by Rakovsky, Joffe, Radchenko, Scheinmann and Tomskey for Russia.

The Anglo-Russian negotiations had been conducted under unusually difficult circumstances. British Tories and irreconcilables joined in a common vilification of the other side's motives. In Britain, class fears were aroused over the bogey of Communism to such an extent as to overshadow domestic issues. In the USSR Trotsky and Zinovyev frequently expressed their vitriolic hatred for the British bourgeoisie, lending strong arguments to opponents of the Conference. The claims of Leslie Urquhart, a leading British oil magnate, whose opposition at the Genoa Conference helped to bring about its collapse, irritated the Russians. In Moscow the rooms of Urquhart's attorney were invaded by the OGPU., the Soviet political police, but restitution was made in time to prevent an "incident."<sup>38</sup> *The Times* carried daily reports of Communist insults to the British Government and declared that the Soviet diplomats were using the Conference as a smoke-screen for their intrigues against Britain in Afghanistan.<sup>39</sup>

England's erstwhile ally, France, took a keen interest in the Conference. It was manifest that Poincaré wished to participate. He stated to the press that France would not interfere, but if the British Government showed itself willing to bring her former ally into the Conference the French Ambassador would refer the matter to Paris.<sup>40</sup> Later he expressed his objections to a separate Anglo-Russian conference, declaring that "an international solidarity should exist among all foreign creditors."<sup>41</sup> Any treaty provision with "most-favoured nation" clauses, the French felt, was unfair to the other creditors.

Roumania regarded the Anglo-Soviet Conference uneasily, fearing the overturn of the Bessarabian settlement, as determined by Roumanian arms and allied diplomacy. Russia had never reconciled herself to the loss of this valuable territory, which had been taken from her by the treaty of October, 1920, without her consent. In order to reassure herself that the Bolsheviks would not succeed in introducing the Bessarabian question into the agenda, Roumania sent her Foreign Minister, M. Duca, to London. Although the

<sup>38</sup> *The Times*, 1 March, 1924.

<sup>39</sup> *Ibid.*, 13 May, *The World Today* carried a series of offensive personal sketches of the Soviet diplomats, A. Bott, "Anglo-Russ Negotiations," *ibid.*, July, 1924.

<sup>40</sup> *The Times*, 10 April.

<sup>41</sup> Fischer, *The Soviets in World Affairs*, II, 570, *Le Temps*, 9 August.



MacDonald-Duca interview was not published, the editor of *The Times* stressed its political significance. Subsequently MacDonald repeated his refusal to recognise a Bessarabian question.<sup>42</sup> The Russians were greatly disappointed. Litvinov, it appears, was certain at the time that the Bessarabian problem would occupy an important place in the London Conference.<sup>43</sup> Rakovsky had been keenly interested in the matter, and had given the British representative an *aide-memoire* on the subject at the Vienna Conference of March, 1924.<sup>44</sup>

The proposed treaties drew fire from Liberal as well as from Conservative organs on a number of grounds, but chiefly because of the loan to Russia. *The Times*, quoting an alleged statement of Kamenev in *Pravda*, declared that the sudden British capitulation following the deadlock was due to local Communist pressure.<sup>45</sup> The *Nation* declared that there could be no confidence in the probity of the Soviet Government.<sup>46</sup> To the editor of the *New Statesman* the treaty guaranteed a loan that would be "an artificial prolongation in Russia of an economic system which is impracticable." Besides, Russia never paid her debts, but borrowed to meet interest on old loans.<sup>47</sup> The *Manchester Guardian*, keeping to its independent course, disagreed with its colleagues.

"The world has tried before the plan of outlawing a people, and the experiment was disastrous... This treaty is a declaration to Europe that we have abandoned that policy."<sup>48</sup>

Big business in England expressed its condemnation of the treaties in no uncertain terms. In a resolution adopted on 21 August, the London Chamber of Commerce denounced the treaties and petitioned the Government not to be responsible for a loan to Russia.<sup>49</sup> Other organisations quickly followed. The Association of the British Chambers of Commerce, the Federation of British Industries, the Chambers of Shipping in the United Kingdom, and others joined in a common denunciation of the loan feature in the general treaty as a dangerous risk and a harmful precedent.<sup>50</sup> A

<sup>42</sup> *The Times*, 3 May.

<sup>43</sup> *Russian Review*, 1 May, 1924.

<sup>44</sup> *Russian Information and Review*, 23 August.

<sup>45</sup> *The Times*, 7 August.

<sup>46</sup> Editorial, "More Light on the Russian Treaty," *Nation*, 13 September; also "Russian Treaty Supplement" in *Ibid.*, 18 October.

<sup>47</sup> Editorial, "The Russian Treaties," *New Statesman*, 16 August.

<sup>48</sup> *Manchester Guardian*, 7 August.

<sup>49</sup> *The Times*, 22 August.

<sup>50</sup> *Ibid.*, 17 September.

slight slump which overtook the Exchange was attributed to the fears aroused by the proposed Russian agreement. MacDonald bitterly attacked Sir Robert Horne and other Conservative leaders for deliberately instigating the market slump as a form of economic pressure upon the community.<sup>51</sup>

Labour fought back in the press and on the platform. Its huge trade-unionist constituency rallied around the Anglo-Russian treaties. The Trade Union Congress, then in session, said to represent 4,500,000 members, was told by its chairman, A. Purcell, M.P., that the entire Labour movement must back the treaties at all costs and that the fate of the Labour Ministry depended upon its success.<sup>52</sup> Tomsky, a member of the Russian delegation at the Conference and president of the All-Russian Council of Trade Unions, appeared before the Congress to support the treaties and to praise the Britons as "the grandfathers of the working-class movement." Resolutions were passed congratulating the Government upon the treaties and urging the Executive Committee of the Labour Party to take steps to counter-act the hostile Press campaign.<sup>53</sup>

Meanwhile the defection of the Liberals, upon whose favour the Labour Government depended, became a foregone conclusion, and soon made it necessary for MacDonald to appeal to the country in a general election if he would save the treaties. From 13 March, 1924 to the end of July, the Labour Government had been defeated ten times on various questions in the House of Commons, defeats due to wholesale desertion by the Liberals. Conservatives, who absolved themselves from any governmental alliance, voted consistently against the Ministry.<sup>54</sup> At the Easter adjournment in Parliament there had been an exchange of verbal hostilities between Liberal and Labour speakers.<sup>55</sup> The Liberals felt that this Government, so much beholden to them, was trying to obscure their efforts.<sup>56</sup> They felt moreover, that Labour leaders were going over to the protectionist heresy.<sup>57</sup> The Russian treaties appeared a good issue upon which Liberal politics might profit.

Conservatives and Liberals prepared to move independent resolutions of censure against the Government; but the former acted more quickly, and on 8 October Sir Robert Horne denounced Labour

<sup>51</sup> *Ibid.*, 29 September

<sup>52</sup> *The Trade Union Congress Report* (1924), LVI, 70.

<sup>53</sup> *Ibid.*, 395, 510.

<sup>54</sup> *Liberal Magazine*, XXXII, November, 1924.

<sup>55</sup> Editorial, *Nation*, 3 May.

<sup>56</sup> Editorial, "The Temper of Liberalism," *Ibid.*, 10 May.

<sup>57</sup> *Saturday Review*, 23 August.

for the institution and subsequent withdrawal of criminal proceedings against John R. Campbell, editor of a Communist weekly, who was charged with "inciting the King's armed forces to mutiny." The Conservatives intimated that Communist pressure was responsible for the sudden end of the prosecution.<sup>58</sup> The Liberal leader, Asquith, had prepared to state in his motion of censure, that the British taxpayer should not be made liable for further loans to the Russian State.<sup>59</sup> On 9 October Parliament was dissolved, and a general election was ordered. MacDonald, denouncing the Liberals for their false friendship, prepared to stake all on the treaties.<sup>60</sup>

Both sides girded themselves for the fight on the Russian issue, and the exciting tone of the Press was communicated to foreign newspapers. Personal attacks and the Red Menace competed for attention in the public mind. Liberal pamphlets on the treaties were issued in great profusion with the slogan, "The Russians want your money."<sup>61</sup> MacDonald singled out the Liberals for attack, urging his followers to vote Unionist (Conservative) in constituencies where there was no Labour candidate.<sup>62</sup>

Five days before the elections, on Friday, 24 October, came the bombshell of the campaign. On that day Thomas Marlowe, editor of the London *Daily Mail*, published the "scoop" of post-war journalism—the notorious Zinovyev letter. This remarkable document purported to contain a series of instructions to the British Communist Party signed by Zinovyev, head of the Communist International, urging preparations for a general class war against imperialism, the fomenting of mutiny in the British armed forces, and a struggle against those "reactionary circles" which opposed the treaties.<sup>63</sup> Together with this letter, a second document, a reply to the Soviet Government, was published, signed by J. D. Gregory, a permanent official of the Foreign Office, which invited serious suspicions as to whether the Government's hand had been forced:

"... No Government will ever tolerate an arrangement with a foreign Government by which the latter is in formal diplomatic relations of a correct kind with it, whilst, at the same time a propagandist body organically connected with that foreign Government encourages and even orders subjects

<sup>58</sup> *Hansard*, Fifth Series, CLXXVII, 581.

<sup>59</sup> *Liberal Magazine*, XXXII, November, 1924.

<sup>60</sup> *Report of Twenty-Fourth Annual Conference of Labour Party* (London, 1924), 109.

<sup>61</sup> "Pamphlets and Leaflets for 1924," *Liberal Publications Department* (London, 1925), *passim*.

<sup>62</sup> Editorial, *Spectator*, 25 October, 1924.

<sup>63</sup> Also in *The Times*, 25 October, 1924.

of the former to plot and plan revolutions for its overthrow<sup>64</sup>

National attention was arrested by the fact that the *Daily Mail* and *The Times* both had acquired the Zinovyev Letter before its issue by the Foreign Office. The latter had received the document on 15 September, but had not ordered publication until 24 October. According to the anti-Labour Press this was part of MacDonald's strategy to keep the electorate in the dark for his own advantage, but the threat of Marlowe's exposure had forced the Government's hand<sup>65</sup>. How the *Daily Mail* had acquired the damaging documents was unknown at the time, but was generally attributed to some "leak" in the Civil Service<sup>66</sup>.

Three days later, MacDonald, after completing his investigation, granted an interview to *The Times* on the subject of the "Red Letter"<sup>67</sup>. According to his notes, the Zinovyev Letter had arrived at the Foreign Office on 10 October (through the Secret Service, as it proved later). The document had been filed in the Department by 14 October and sent on the following day to MacDonald, who was then in Manchester. He received it on the 16th, sent a minute concerning its authenticity to the Foreign Office, and ordered the preparation of a draft protest addressed to Rakovsky. The trial draft was sent from the Office on the 21st, but failed to reach MacDonald until the 23rd, since he was away at Aberavon, campaigning in his son's constituency. He completed the trial draft, expecting that it would be held up pending proof of the authenticity of the Zinovyev Letter; but the Foreign Office sent the protest document at once to the newspapers without waiting for his signature.<sup>68</sup> This ended all hopes of settling the matter calmly.

<sup>64</sup> *The Times*, 25 October, 1924, complete text in *British State Papers*, 1927, XIV, Enclosure No. 7.

<sup>65</sup> *Manchester Guardian Weekly*, 31 October; *The Times*, 25-26 October.

<sup>66</sup> This was corroborated in 1928 by Marlowe himself, who declared that he had originally learned of the existence of the documents through a Mr. Thurn, a London business man "in close touch with the Communist circles in England" who claimed responsibility for the arrival of the copies of the Zinovyev Letter at both the Foreign Office and at the *Daily Mail*. This had been done "as a patriotic duty" to defeat the Russian Treaties, *Hansard*, Fifth Series, 215, 19 March, 1928. Marlowe of the *Daily Mail* had sent a copy to *The Times* as well for publication. *The Observer* (London), 4 March, 1928.

<sup>67</sup> *The Times*, 27 October, 1924.

<sup>68</sup> The Foreign Office had learned of Marlowe's contemplated step and, desiring to protect MacDonald, Sir Eyre Crowe quickly decided to issue a draft of the Prime Minister's reply to Rakovsky as well as the Zinovyev Letter itself to the press. *The Observer*, 4 March, 1928, *Hansard*, vol. CCXV, 47-108.

Meanwhile the Gregory note to the Soviet Government had provoked an angry response. The Russian reply, signed by Litvinov, denounced the Red Letter as a clumsy forgery and offered to submit the question to a court of arbitration. He expressed indignation at the sharp terms of the British note and requested an immediate apology.<sup>69</sup> Rakovsky protested against the publicity given the British note, a procedure which he felt was an obstacle to friendly relations. He attacked the Zinovyev Letter as "a gross forgery and an audacious attempt to prevent the development of friendly relations between the two countries."<sup>70</sup>

Election day brought the predicted defeat of Labour which lost 40 seats, retaining only 152 representatives. The Conservatives swept the constituencies, winning 405 seats, a gain of 154. But the Liberals suffered most among the opposition groups, losing 113 seats to their rivals and retaining but 39.<sup>71</sup> Domestic issues, such as unemployment and free trade, were prominent but secondary to the Russian issue. Everywhere the country was plastered over with pictures of red monsters together with warnings about atheism, and stories of the nationalisation of women in Soviet Russia.<sup>72</sup>

After 287 days of office, the Labour Government came to an end, discredited to some extent by the Zinovyev Letter episode and the Russian treaties. The editor of the *Nation* thus commented on the Soviet influence upon British domestic politics: "Never before,

<sup>69</sup> *British State Papers*, 1927, XIV, Enc. 8.

<sup>70</sup> *Ibid*. That the Zinovyev Letter is a forgery seems to be well established. Its provenance was never determined. Marlowe's two copies—no original has yet been shown—differ in that one is addressed to McManus of the British Communist Party and the other makes him the signee. (*Observer*, 4 March, 1928.) McManus himself was in Russia at the time the letter was supposed to have been sent and then living as a close neighbour to Zinovyev. *Hansard*, vol. CCXV, 74, 79, 80, 102. Communist circulars, according to Rakovsky, were never headed "Third Communist International" as the Zinovyev Letter was purported to be. Besides Zinovyev could not have signed himself as "President of the Præsidium of the Executive Committee of the Communist International" since he was, and signed as "President of the Executive Committee." *The Times*, 27 October, 1924. A British Trade Union delegation to Russia in November and December, 1924, examined the Communist archives and were convinced by their researches that no such message, even in oral form, could have been issued. *Report of Trade Union Congress* (London, 1925), LVII, 293. See also Louis Fischer's analysis in his *Soviets in World Affairs*, II, 493.

<sup>71</sup> Editorial, "The Election," *Spectator*, 8 November, 1924; *Manchester Guardian*, 3 November. The severity of the Liberal defeat was partly attributed to the fact that in 222 of the contested seats there had been no Liberal candidate. *Liberal Magazine*, XXXII, November, 1924.

<sup>72</sup> Sir Arthur Ponsonby, "Case for the Treaties," *Contemporary Review*, December, 1924.

since the French Revolution, has the régime of a foreign country had so powerful an influence here."<sup>73</sup>

With the accession of the second Baldwin Government, the Russian treaties were quietly discarded by being withheld from Parliament, leaving the Trade Agreement of 1921 and the irrevocable *de jure* recognition of the USSR as the sole basis of Anglo-Russian relations. Despite the succeeding relapse in relations with Russia, the MacDonald Ministry during its brief term had done much to prepare the way for the entrance of the Soviet State as a co-operating member into the family of nations and had ended the first phase of Russian isolation with its recurrent threats to World peace.

HARVEY WISH.

<sup>73</sup> Editorial, *Nation*, 8 November, 1924.

## THE MAKING OF MODERN SLOVENIA<sup>1</sup>

WHEN, in the year A.D. 568, the Lombards migrated into Italy from the Panonian plain, the empty spaces they left behind them were filled by incoming Slavs from beyond the Carpathians, from what is now Galicia, Volhynia and Podolia. Pushing on, indeed, far beyond the plain of Hungary, the southern group of tribes colonised the greater part of the Balkan Peninsula as far as the three seas which wash its shores.

Farther north the Czechs occupied the lands vacated by the migrating German tribes up to the borders of what is now Bavaria, while the Slovenes penetrated far into the Alps. For a time these two kindred tribes, separated from each other only by the Danube, formed a single realm under the great Samo, but in 662 this empire fell apart, and the Slovenes were ruled for the next century or two by a line of native princes. The lands occupied by this little people at the present day are a mere remnant of their original territories, which extended into the Pustertal district of the Tyrol and into the Friulian plain as far as the Tagliamento (where a few thousands of their descendants still speak Slovene today), and included the greater part of the present Austria as far as Salzburg and the line of the Danube.

Thinly settled and badly organised as they were, the Slovenes were easily driven back when two or three centuries later the Germans returned to the territories they had abandoned, but as late as the 13th century the Slovenes were to be found as far north as the Mürztal, and they have profoundly influenced the customs and the dialects of German Austria. Graz itself is but the Germanised form of the Slovene Gradec, just as Gorizia and Gradišca are Gorica and Gradiška. Dr Schuschnigg's grandfather was a Slovene from Kannik.

It is the misfortune of the Slovenes that the corner of the earth they chose to occupy was one in which for geographical reasons they could never be allowed to live in peace. Their beautiful little country is so varied in character that its narrow boundaries include stretches of the Mediterranean coast, of the Alps, of the limestone Karst country, and of the great Hungarian plain. These physical formations are but symbols of the four races which claim them, for

<sup>1</sup> This article forms one chapter in a forthcoming book on Yugoslavia, by the author of *The Balkan Road* and other books.

Slovenia stands exactly at the meeting place of the four principal races of Europe, the Latin, the Germanic, the Slavonic and, in the shape of the Hungarians, the Turanian. Such a country could never be long at peace, even had it not lain at the coveted cross-roads of Europe. The Slovenes barred the shortest road alike from Central Europe to the Mediterranean and to the desired of all the barbarian nations, Italy, and from Constantinople into the heart of Europe.

In 778 the recently Christianised Slovenes were conquered by Charlemagne, and after the defeat of their prince, Ljudevit Posavski, in the next century they lost the last remnants of their independence. In the 10th century the Duchy of Carantania was formed out of what were later to be the provinces of Carinthia, Carniola and Styria and governed by the German ducal families first of Eppenstein and later of Sponheim. After the Battle of Marchfeld in 1278 the territory fell to Rudolf of Habsburg. Even under their German rulers, however, the Slovenes preserved for a time some picturesque relics of their national sovereignty. Each new Duke of Carinthia, on his installation, had to go to the Field of Gospa Sveta, north of Klagenfurt, which had been the old capital of the Slovene princes. There, dressed in peasant costume, and leading a horse and an ass, he approached a freeborn Slovene peasant seated on the ancient coronation stone and swore to him to respect the speech, customs and institutions of the Slovenes.

Ernest of Habsburg in 1414 was the last Duke to be installed in the traditional manner, but long before then the rights of the Slovenes had become a dead letter. The old Duchy of Carantania had already been cut up into Marks, and the Habsburgs systematically rooted out the native aristocracy, made large grants of Slovene land to German monasteries and bishoprics such as Brixen and Bamberg, and imported German colonists. The great "island" of twelve thousand Germans round Kočevje, for example, dates back as far as 1363.

The Germanising process was aided by the Turkish menace, against which the Slovenes fought side by side with the Croats and the Serbs, with little time left to develop a culture of their own. Until the end of the 18th century almost the only name in Slovene literature is that of Primož Trubar, the Reformer who translated the Bible into Slovene. Trubar's circle, indeed, was a short foreshadowing of South Slav cultural unity, for his helpers, besides Adam Bohorič, the author of the first Slovene grammar, included George Dalmatin from Dalmatia, Konsul from Istria, Juričič from



Croatia, Maleševac from Bosnia and Popović from Serbia. In Slovenia, however, as in Bohemia, the Counter-Reformation speedily stifled Protestantism, and Slav literature with it.

It was the Counter-Reformation Period which gave Slovenia, like Austria and Bohemia, the characteristic appearance which it wears today, but, although the 17th and 18th centuries were a brilliant flowering time for the plastic arts, as manifested in the great baroque churches, monuments and sculptures of Ljubljana and other towns, the Slovene tongue, which had been spoken at the Court of Vienna up to the 13th century, remained the language only of illiterate peasants until the end of the 18th century, when the influence of the Rationalist, Romantic and French Revolutionary movements awakened the national consciousness of a group of Slovene intellectuals.

The chief figure of the Slovene cultural renaissance at this period was the poet Valentin Vodnik, who founded the first Slovene newspaper at Ljubljana in 1797, and later, as director of public instruction for Napoleon's protectorate of the Illyrian Provinces, had Slovene taught in the schools on an equality with German and Italian.

The return of the Habsburgs extinguished the political freedom of the Slavs for another century to come, but the cultural movement survived. France Prešeren, the greatest of Slovene poets, established beyond challenge the position of Slovene as a literary language and, under the guidance of Janez Bleiweis, the Slovene intellectuals remained strongly imbued with a sense of South Slav unity—what was then known as "Illyrianism." In the revolutionary year 1848 Slovene deputies for the first time attended the Vienna Parliament, and demanded a Slovene university, equality of treatment for Slovenes and Germans, and the unification of the Slovene territories into a single province of "Slovenia," a word coined for the first time in that year.

In some respects the last-named demand was the most important of all, for, after the failure of the revolutionary movement, the resistance of the Slovenes to Germanisation was greatly hindered by the fact that their territory, though geographically a compact block, was divided into no fewer than six administrative units, in only one of which, Carniola, where they formed 95 per cent. of the population, could they command a majority in the Diet, and thereby retain some measure of control over their own affairs.

In the Küstenland, which comprised the Margravate of Istria, the Autonomous Town and Territory of Trieste, and the county of Gorizia-Gradisca, the Slovenes formed only a third of the population

according to the census of 1910. Central and Eastern Istria had never belonged to Venice, being conquered from the Byzantines by the Slavs, and passing with them to the Dukes of Carantania. Nevertheless, the Slovenes were outnumbered by the Italians in the western coast-towns, such as Pola, Parenzo, Rovigno and Pirano, and by the Croats in the interior, which consisted mostly of the desolate limestone uplands known locally as the Karst. Since 1808 onwards the Croatian islands of Krk, Kreš and Losinj were also included in Istria.

In Trieste the Slovenes had a majority in the suburbs, but, although most of the shipping and a good share of the banking and hotel businesses were in their hands, and although they possessed a hundred and forty cultural, economic, athletic and similar societies, the Italians outnumbered them by two to one in the town as a whole. The larger part of the county of Gorizia-Gradisca was Slovene, but the town of Gorizia itself was half Italian, and the Gradisca-Monfalcone district at the mouth of the Isonzo was solidly Italian. The Küstenland will concern us little, since, with the exception of the Croat island of Krk, the whole of it was ceded to Italy after the Great War.

The three pre-war provinces of Carniola, Styria and Carinthia were very hilly, with plains only in Eastern Styria and in the Ljubljana Basin, formerly the bed of a lake, while Western Carniola was Karst and Northern Carniola Alpine. The population, therefore, averaged no more than fifty-six to the square kilometre. In 1910 there were 491,000 Slovenes in Carniola, 410,000 in Styria and 120,000 in Carinthia. In addition to these and to the 400,000 in the Küstenland, there were a hundred thousand in the adjacent Prekmurje district of Hungary, forty thousand over the Italian border, and something over a hundred thousand in America.

This figure, or hardly more than a million and a half, represents what was left of this little people after centuries of absorption by the Italians and the Germans, who formed a majority in every Slovenian city except Ljubljana, the former in Trieste and Gorizia, and the latter in Maribor, Klagenfurt and Celje. Germanisation, especially in the latter half of the 19th century, proceeded with such force that between 1851 and 1910 the proportion of the population which returned itself as Slovene fell from 36 per cent. to 29 per cent. in Styria, and from 29 per cent. to 21 per cent. in Carinthia, which over a thousand years before had been the centre and heart of independent Slovenia. Had the Great War not supervened, it is far

from improbable that the Slovenes of these two provinces would have been completely absorbed in another century or two

In Carinthia and Styria, which bore the brunt of the attack, the German objective was to push the linguistic frontier steadily southward. Societies were formed for the purpose of buying out the Slovene proprietors and settling Germans on their land, determined efforts were made to weed out Slovene officials from the administration and to oust Slovene judges from the bench; the Deutsche Schulverein disposed of large funds for the foundation of German schools, so that everywhere except in Carniola the Slovenes lost their proper proportion of educational institutions. There were only three Slovene primary schools in Carinthia, and not a single one in Trieste, where the State taught only German and Italian.

The methods and results of the reaction to Germanisation must be examined in some detail, because it was this reaction which created modern Slovenia, and the country today cannot be understood without a knowledge of it. In the first place the movement was initiated and led by the priests who formed and controlled the Slovene People's Party. As far back as 1860 resistance was organised in Istria by Bishop Dobrila of Trieste, and for decades before the War the Catholics were practically synonymous with the Slovene Nationalists. This accounts for the domination of clericalism in Slovenia even today.

The Slovenes fought on three main fronts: political, cultural and economic. The twenty-four Slovene deputies in the Vienna Parliament (eleven from Carniola, seven from Styria, three from Gorizia-Gradisca, and one each from Carinthia, Trieste and Istria) did all they could to defend the Slovene officials and judges, and they also fought hard, but unsuccessfully, for a Slovene university in Ljubljana. In Imperial politics they were Trialist, for it was Dualism which divided them from their Croat brethren on the south and kept them a weak and helpless minority. Trialism, moreover, would exclude the possibility of a union with the Orthodox Serbians, who were long disliked by the clericals.

To counteract the activities of the Deutsche Schulverein, the Družba Sv. Kirila i Metoda (Society of SS. Cyril and Methodius) was founded in 1884. It was this society which financed and managed the Slav schools in Trieste and elsewhere. The success of the Slovene educationalists is shown by the fact that when the Italians took over Gorizia-Gradisca they found that the "barbarous" Slovene peasants there had an illiteracy rate of under 15 per cent., or much lower than their own.

To these pioneers the Slovenes owe the fact that their culture today is not merely the heritage of an aristocratic or intellectual minority, but is solidly built up on a peasant foundation. Slovene education is a pyramidal structure based on the 815 primary schools which cover the country. Next come the fourteen secondary schools and the various agricultural, commercial and technical colleges. The apex of the whole is Ljubljana University, the foundation of which in 1919 was one of the very first acts of the Slovenes on gaining their independence. It now comprises the five faculties of letters, law, science, theology and medicine, and with nearly two thousand students it is already larger than many a flourishing German university.

Side by side with the education of youth, cultural work among adults, its necessary corollary, was and is carried on by such societies as the *Prosvetna Zveža* (Educational Union), with twenty-five thousand members, and the *Zveža Kulturnih Društev* (Union of Cultural Societies), with fifty thousand. These and similar opsimathic organisations possess branches in the remotest villages, where they run clubhouses, libraries, reading rooms, dramatic and choral societies, and so forth. Physical education is in the hands of the *Sokols*, which have fifty thousand members, and which also comprise cultural sections.

Today there are over a million books in the five hundred public libraries of Yugoslav Slovenia. There is small profit for a private publisher appealing to a total population of a million people, and co-operative publishing houses were early launched to supply the Slovenes with literature in their own tongue. The first and largest was the *Družba Sv. Mohorja* (Society of St. Hermagoras), which was founded in 1852 at Klagenfurt, a city which even at that date had a Slovene majority. This society numbered a hundred thousand members (or one for every fourteen Slovenes), and for a subscription of two kronen supplied them with six new books a year. Its success led to the foundation of several similar publishing societies. Realising that if and when they obtained their longed-for university they would need their own learned literature and terminology, the Slovenes in 1863 founded the *Matica Slovenska*, which up to the War not only served as the principal Slovene literary and scientific association, but rivalled the Society of St. Hermagoras as the leading publishing concern.

In 1869 the first Slovene savings bank was established in Windischgrätz, followed quickly by three more, also in South Styria, but the economic fight may be said really to date from 1872, when

the first savings bank was founded on a co-operative basis. In a surprisingly short time the economic system of the country was transformed. First came the credit co-operatives, to which the peasants lent their savings, and which in turn lent them out again. They were followed by consumers' co-operatives, agricultural co-operatives, purchasing, selling and marketing co-operatives, domestic animals, timber, fruit-growing, wine-growing and dairying co-operatives. In the industrial field co-operation was less widely extended, but there, too, it became an important force, and before the War there were about a thousand flourishing Slovene co-operatives. Their number is, of course, smaller now that half a million Slovenes have been cut off from the main body

The success of the co-operatives was due to various factors: to patriotic feeling, to the constructive spirit of the Catholic priests, and to the practical outlook and social sense of the people, but it would hardly have been possible had the Slovene territories not been essentially a land of free peasant proprietors and varied small industries.

Except for some of the territory now Italian, Slovenia enjoys a "Continental" climate with a mean annual temperature of 12° C. in its southern districts. Northern Carniola, with its longer and colder winter, has a mean temperature of only 10°. This is due not only to the presence of the Julian Alps (Triglav is over eight thousand feet high), but to the fact that the Karst barrier forces the warmer, and therefore lighter, sea air off Slovenia, and substitutes cold air instead. This accounts for the difference between the January average of -2.5° in Ljubljana and +3.2° in Trieste, and for the fact that the Mediterranean vegetation of the seaboard gives place, east of the Karst, to Central European products such as maize. The moisture required for these crops is provided by the high rainfall typical of the southern slopes of the Alps; Ljubljana, for example, has an average of 142 cms., compared with the 96 of Klagenfurt just beyond the mountains, and the 64 of Vienna.

The limestone country of Istria and Western Carniola is unfavourable for cultivation and thinly peopled. The only important centre of population is at Idria, now Italian, which centres round the second largest quicksilver mine in Europe. The primeval rocks of Styria are also unsuited to agriculture, but they carry heavy timber, and half the province is forest. The clay and sandstone districts of South Styria are largely agricultural, and Ljutomer, in particular, is noted for its excellent hock-type wines.

Carinthia is excluded from any discussion of post-War Slovenia, since the plebiscite of 1919 resulted in a majority for Austria, and cut off the 120,000 Slovenes of Carinthia, like the 400,000 of the Kustenland, from their newly freed brethren in Carniola, South Styria and Prekmurje. The Slovenes are still bitter about the result of this plebiscite, which they claim would have gone the other way had the Yugoslav Government followed their advice and promised the Carinthians exemption from conscription and other burdens from which demilitarised Austria was free.

Carniola, economically as politically, geographically and racially, is the heart of Slovenia. Sixty per cent of its people are engaged in agriculture, stock-raising and forestry, but such secondary industries as cheesemaking, tanning, shoemaking, cellulose- and paper-making are on the increase. There are, too, numerous home industries, such as spinning, weaving and straw-hat-making. The ironworks of Noricum were well-known in Roman times, and the production of small quantities of iron ore, combined with plentiful brown coal or lignite, long ago led to flourishing local industries. Typical of these miniature industrial centres is the village of Kropa, whose inhabitants discovered as far back as the 13th century that the exploitation of the local iron ore was more profitable than trying to wring a living from a barren soil, and took to manufacturing nails for the neighbouring villages. Gradually they gave up agriculture altogether, and today all the hundred or two able-bodied inhabitants of the village may still be seen in the co-operative factory making nails by hand just as their fathers made them for many centuries.

While the Styrians are almost entirely farmers, foresters and stockbreeders, the agricultural implement factories of Tržič, the iron and tinplate works of Jesenice, the lead and zinc mines of Raibl, the aluminium clay which takes its name of wocheinite from the Bohinj (Wochein) valley, the potter's earth of Kamnik, the kitchen utensils, glass, cement, brick, tile, and other industries scattered about in towns like Ljubljana, Kranj, Kamnik and Tržič, have made Carniola the industrial centre of Jugoslavia, so far as it can be said to have one.

In addition to several million tons of brown coal (especially plentiful in the Trbolje district), Carniola produces over a million tons of timber yearly, and its wealth of water power favours the development of sawmills. The Fala power station near Maribor develops a maximum of thirty thousand horse-power, but there are numerous smaller stations, and many remote villages are equipped

with electric light. The "white coal" potentialities of Slovenia are enormous, and it has been calculated that there is a hundred thousand horse-power in the Upper Sava valley alone, waiting to be harnessed should the country ever become sufficiently industrialised to need them. In addition to electricity and lumbering, the water power is used to assist the textile industry, especially at Ljubljana and Tržič.

Some of these industries are privately owned, but the majority of them belong to the various co-operatives. Independent, Liberal and Socialist co-operatives have all played their part in the movement, but the most widespread and powerful are still the Catholic co-operatives founded by Father Klek half a century ago, for the economic system of Slovenia, built up originally as a bulwark against Germanisation, has remained almost unchanged since its incorporation in Jugoslavia.

Ljubljana, the Slovene capital, is an ancient city of some seventy thousand people. Founded originally by the Romans, it has seen much history pass by. In 1821, as Laibach, it was the scene of a Congress of the Holy Alliance, and the Emperors of Austria and Russia, the King of the Two Sicilies, and princes, ministers, dukes and ambassadors galore, thronged its chestnut-shaded streets and quays for a few hectic weeks. But probably in a quiet way Ljubljana is prouder of itself now than ever old Laibach was, even in 1821, for, in addition to its new Slovene University, it boasts a National Theatre, an Opera House, a National Museum, an Ethnographical Museum, a National Library, a National Gallery of Art, a Conservatoire, a Philharmonic, a Commercial Academy, a School of Arts and Crafts, and all the other cultural adjuncts of a city many times its size.

The old Gothic castle of the Iron Duke Ernest frowns upon a hill above the narrow, crooked streets of the old town, but for the rest Ljubljana is a city of the 17th and 18th centuries, of large, solid houses built round enormous courtyards, of baroque churches, squares and monuments, and quiet, broad, shady streets—a Salzburg inhabited by Slavs.

But if Ljubljana dates architecturally from the Austrian baroque period, she dates socially and economically from the counter-Austrian reaction before the War. There is no German or Jewish shopkeeping class in Ljubljana, as there is in Maribor, Celje and the Styrian towns, for the co-operative movement drove them out of business. Half the city is in the hands of the Catholic co-operatives, who own the principal hotels, restaurants, cinemas and *Keller*. The

Jugoslovanska Tiskarna, which publishes the People's Party daily, *Slovenec*, is the largest printing works in Yugoslavia, and boasts the only nine-colour process plant for photographic reproduction in Central Europe. This, too, belongs to the Catholics, although it was an independent insurance co-operative which gave Ljubljana the highest skyscraper in Central Europe in the shape of the thirteen-storey *Nebotičnik*, which towers incongruously over the little old city and seems to challenge the Iron Duke's 15th century castle on its height.

It was one of the chief grievances of the Slovenes against the dictatorship of King Alexander that their Catholic organisations were forbidden under the regional and confessional law; their co-operatives, too, suffered severely during the same period of economic crisis and political repression. In the bank panic of 1931, for example, there was a serious run on the *Zadružna Gospodarska Banka* (the Co-operative Farmers' Bank), which performed the very creditable feat of paying off three-quarters of its depositors before, like all the other banks, it had to apply for a moratorium. The Government answered the appeals of the Serbian co-operatives, but punished the Slovenes for their political recalcitrance by refusing them assistance, taking over their co-operative funds and appointing the directors itself.

Now, however, everything is all right again. The co-operatives are free and flourishing, the Catholic organisations are once more permitted, and the Slovenes have three representatives in the Cabinet in Dr. Korošec and MM. Krek and Kozul, and their own Slovene Ban of the Drava in Dr. Natlačen. It only wants the arrival of the promised Banovinal Autonomy to make them almost completely contented.

Slovenia, like the rest of Yugoslavia, is divided into three main political groupings. Dr. Kramer, for decades the leader of the old Liberal Party which opposed the clericals, now heads the Slovene fraction of the centralist Yugoslav National Party. On the left the groups led by MM. Kukovec, Vidmar, Puc and Lončar form part of Maček's Extra-Parliamentary Opposition. But four-fifths of Slovenia still remains faithful to Dr. Korošec's Slovene People's Party, which fought for Slovene rights before the War, declared for union with the Serbs and Croats in 1917, and now forms part of the Radical Union Government.

The Slovenes on the whole fit very happily into the framework of Yugoslavia. That their tiny country, surrounded as it is by greedy Powers, cannot hope to survive as an independent State



is recognised even by the obscure separatist group which not long ago voted to apply for Dominion status in the British Empire.

The Slovenes are a very practical people, and ever since the formation of Yugoslavia they have pursued a realistic policy in marked contrast with that of the Croats. ("Of course, our natural allies are the Croats," a Slovene politician remarked to the writer, "but how can anyone work with the Croats?") As a result they have not to suffer any such "discrimination" as the Croats complain of. Although there were no Slovenes in the diplomatic service or in the higher ranks of the army in the old Austrian days, there are now two Slovene generals on the active list, and Slovene ministers have represented Yugoslavia in such important diplomatic posts as Washington and Buenos Aires.

The Slovenes, few in numbers though they are, have skilfully exploited their strategic situation, which enables them frequently to hold the balance between the other two races in the country, to obtain what in practice amounts to a large measure of autonomy. Aided by the possession of a language distinct from that of the rest of the country, they have been able to keep all but a very few Serb and Croat functionaries out of their Banovina of the Drava and to staff it completely with Slovenes.

Of all the three races which comprise Yugoslavia the Slovenes have probably benefited most from the Union, for, while keeping their own little country to themselves, they have been able to make a profitable use of the rest of Yugoslavia. Their honesty, cleanliness and industry have placed them at a premium in the labour market, and in hotels and private houses all over the kingdom Slovene servants are to be found. Slovene industry, also, has gained immensely by the Union, for, instead of having to compete with the highly developed industries of Bohemia in Austria, it now has an undeveloped and largely unexploited Yugoslavia for its market. The only fly in the ointment is the regulation that no new factories may be started in Yugoslavia without the permission of the Government, which does not allow any more heavy industries to be established in Slovenia on the ground of its dangerous proximity to the border. (Jesenice, the seat of the most important ironworks, is actually the frontier station.)

The principal Slovene grievances are administrative rather than political. The Slovenes complain chiefly of the excessive centralisation, under which they cannot build a road or a bridge without reference to Belgrade, a proceeding which may involve six months' delay and bribery. The appointments of schoolteachers and the

choice of schoolbooks are all made in Belgrade. There is as yet nothing comparable with our county councils, and the Banovina has no control over its own finances, taxes are collected and sent to Belgrade, whence the money is returned, or part of it, for the Slovenes complain that though they pay a quarter of the taxes in Yugoslavia (incidentally every section of Yugoslavia is profoundly convinced that it, and it alone, foots most of the bill for the running of the country) Belgrade has so far only presented Ljubljana with a post office, a barracks and an Orthodox church.

It is precisely such grievances as these which Banovinal Autonomy is designed to remedy. For the rest Slovenia's position on the frontier, wedged between Italy, Austria and Hungary, has taught its people the necessity of a strong Yugoslavia. Unlike certain sections of the Serbs, however, they do not hold that "strength" is only to be found in a centralised dictatorship. They are intensely democratic and they favour a measure of decentralisation, which is quite a different thing from Maček's federalism. They look forward to the future with contentment and hope, for they have a strong faith in the Regent Prince Paul, who has his summer home in the Slovene Alps, speaks their language and has always shown great sympathy with them.

Prince Paul's villa at Bohinj and the summer palace of the Royal family at Bled are in the centre of the beautiful mountain district whose reputation as a cheap and unspoilt Switzerland is attracting tourists from all over Europe in winter and summer alike. The tourist industry of Slovenia, centred round the climbing and winter sports of the Alpine districts and the possession of such important thermal stations as Rogaška Slatina, brings a great deal of money into the country, and is second only to that of Dalmatia.

This sturdy, snug, even slightly smug, little people, rich and well organised as it is, enjoys the diplomatic and military protection and the economic advantages of being part of a State of fifteen million people, and yet in practice it runs its own little land itself. The Slovenes are in Yugoslavia and yet apart from it. They place the good of Slovenia first and last in all their calculations, and it is not necessary to impute to them any very deep sentimental feeling for Yugoslavia as a whole or to look farther than their own self-interest to realise why that very motive makes them in practice as good and as staunch Yugoslavs as any in the country except perhaps their fellow-frontiersmen in Dalmatia.

# SLAVONIC CITIES

## WARSAW

Dla Polaków ojciec Kraków

A Warszawa matka !

In spite of all what modern industrialism has done to ruin them, cities are still—as they use to be, the finest expression of civilisation. They are also its chief nourishers. Those of Poland are no exception, although the relation of urban life to national culture is not so close in Eastern Europe as in the West. Among Polish cities Warsaw occupies a unique position. It belongs neither to the oldest, whose traditions are wholly Gothic, not to the very newest—Łódź, Katowice and Gdynia. One finds in Warsaw lovely Gothic, but not much; a wide range of late Renaissance and of Baroque, a good deal of classical work from the age of Schinkel in Berlin, and then a blank, until our own generation. As was well said not long since, Warsaw lacks just what Poland lacks as a whole—the 19th century. The transformation of Vienna, the work associated with the name of Haussman in Paris—nothing of this kind could be done in the Polish capital.

The oldest cities of Poland owed much to the introduction of the *jus teutonicum* or *Magdeburger Recht*, and the settling of thousands of German artisans and business people in the 13th century. In Warsaw there was less of this, though alien elements were here very early, and that from every quarter: from as far away as Scotland in the west and as Armenia in the East. For reasons that will appear below, Warsaw developed as the most Polish of cities, a purely political centre; and it may well be said that its history combines much of what is best with some of the very worst things in the Polish tradition. For six and a half centuries the record is unbroken, though there were serious lapses, and times of bloodshed and ruin. Today the Polish capital numbers a million and a quarter souls, and is in the way of becoming one of the most important railway junctions in Europe.

### I.

That there was a fishing village on the high banks of the Vistula, in the middle of the great plain, that it became a place of call for the raftsmen who used the river to move a variety of goods to market, and that about 1286 organised community life existed here, under the suzerainty of the Masovian Dukes—those are the salient

facts about the origins of Warsaw. By 1400 there were counted two hundred houses, and the oval-shaped town was fortified by a wall on the three land sides. At the south end was the castle—residence of the Dukes, just inside the Cracow Gate. The finest of the burgher houses were grouped about a big Square; and when a big fire wiped out most of them in 1431, they were all rebuilt in more durable form—in brick and stone instead of wood. During the years of expansion that followed, the charming Gothic Church of St. Mary rose above the New Town, to the north, while in the neighbourhood of the Castle the sister Church of St. John was built. Destroyed by fire in 1598, it was restored in the same style, to become the Cathedral of today.

Few cities in Europe presented a more variegated scene than the Old Town Square during the three yearly Fairs. Warsaw was literally a meeting-place of two worlds. Closer to the Baltic than to the Black Sea, it maintained live contacts with both. So too, it did business with Breslau on the Oder, even with Nurnberg; and in the other direction with the Hansa cities of the north, and the Muscovites of the east. Like other medieval towns, Warsaw had her arts and crafts organised under Guilds. The oldest of these, the Cobblers' Guild, has its records intact—kept in an ancient iron-bound chest, since 1434. A notable date in the life of the Guilds is 1527, when those of Warsaw secured from King Sigismund I, a patent of liberation from ties and duties that had bound them hitherto to their older neighbours in Cracow. The Merchants' Fraternity developed too, especially as the grain trade flourished with Dantzic, but also in other lines. The famed House of the Fuggers from Augsburg settled on the Square, and their cellars were soon stocked with the choicest wines of Europe. The strangest tales are told about these cellars, from which the traveller can still order up a "bottle" today, and enjoy it at his leisure in the ancient tap-room.

With their three-windowed fronts, the burgher houses can be distinguished from those owned by the nobility, as one walks about the Square. Over many of the doors can still be seen devices cut in stone, telling of the occupation of the owner. At one corner is the town house of the celebrated Dukes of Mazovia, with secret dungeons underneath. At another corner of the Square is the one-time home of Father Peter Skarga, greatest preacher of his time, and master of Polish prose. Near by is the house which served until the Partitions as the home of the British Embassy.

The Union of Poland with Lithuania in 1569 was the signal for a new lease of life for Warsaw. In view of this extension of state interests Cracow could no longer serve as capital as before. The first

bridge was thrown over the Vistula at Warsaw. The city became the Royal post-office by King Stephen Batory. Finally, when a fire destroyed part of the royal residence on the Wawel in 1596, King Sigismund III moved his court to Warsaw, and there it remained.

But there was something else. The national Diet, like the early parliaments of England, had been wont to meet in different parts of the country. When a new king had to be elected in 1573, the nobles and their followers assembled on the broad Wola Field outside Warsaw. From this time onward Warsaw became more and more favoured as the place of assembly, and with a curious consequence. The great families began to stake out preserves of a few acres each on the level ground south and south-west of the city walls, and on these to build seasonal residences—for use during the sessions. Each preserve was surrounded by a stockade, and contained stables and barracks for retainers. It was a sort of tiny fortress, necessary enough in times when rivalries were common, and brawls between rival factions broke out only too quickly. Called “jurisdictions,” these units were a sort of law unto themselves. Their owners had nothing in common with the townsmen near by, they refused to recognise the authority of the Town Council, and of course declined to pay taxes. Their number grew when several of the Church Orders took up their stations here as well, so that—at least at certain times of the year, the population of Warsaw outside the walls was larger than that within.

The relations of these two sections of the city were far from cordial. The country gentlemen looked down on the business man or the artisan, though he was ready enough to use him in various ways. To law-abiding burghers, the wild ways of these country squires and their retainers were a constant source of concern, even of annoyance. This mistrust of the city people for the landed nobility deepened into something sterner in the very years just referred to. Foolish legislation of the year 1565 took from the flourishing town populations of Poland almost all their rights in the field of commerce and industry, in favour of the landed gentry. The result was a steady decline of city life and culture, and a disaster of the first magnitude for the nation and the State. When the Swedish invasions came, a century later, Warsaw stood two sieges, was taken and retaken, was sacked and burned—so that little save wreckage was left. For three generations the burgher section of the city stood still.

“Do not be surprised,” wrote a French visitor, “if the city of Warsaw is so small; for its grandeur is to be found in the faubourgs.”

From the terrible visitation of the Swedish Wars the "jurisdictions" did indeed recover. The imposing palace of the Kazanowski family, famous in Europe for its Italian furnishings and even its central heating, was never rebuilt; but others took its place. In fact the years of the Restoration—from 1660 onwards, were a time of great vitality. The first regular newspaper, *The Mercury*, was founded in 1661. In the same year Corneille's *The Cid* was performed at the opening of the Diet. Finally, the first public monument in the capital was set up, the Column of Sigismund III which still stands in Castle Square. Most memorable of all, perhaps, was the energy of John Sobieski who chose the attractive site a few miles above Warsaw on the banks of the river, to build his country residence—known as Vilanow. This sort of thing had its value, but it did nothing to adjust the hopeless internal schism in the life of the city as a whole. The foundations of economic well-being, and with this the organic solidarity of urban culture were strangled. Worst of all, the king had his attention concentrated on other matters, chiefly on defence. As a result the worst of conditions obtained in the heart of the country, and nothing could be done to remedy it.

## II

Such was the state of things when in 1697 the Saxon Dynasty came to the throne of Poland. The first of these kings, August the Strong, was a blind admirer of Louis XIV and of everything associated with Versailles. His ambition was to make a new Dresden on these lines. Wars and other troubles kept him from doing anything of this kind in Warsaw until after 1725. From then on a start was made, however, and the reign of August II saw tremendous changes. The Italian engineer, Giacomo Fontana, made a complete survey of the city: a plan of which, made by the court architect in 1761, has come down to us. The fashion of "conspicuous spending" was set from above—the Prime Minister, Graf Bruehl, taking the lead, and in a generation some fifteen new palaces were added to the score already existing. The Saxon Garden, a prized open space of the City today, was laid out near by.

Fortunately for the nation, this luxury building was not all that went on during these decades. In 1754 the courageous educational reformer, the Piarist Father Konarski, saw his College for Gentlemen's Sons completed and dedicated on Miodowa Street. With this began in earnest the introduction into Poland of the *philosophia recentiorum*, meaning the spirit of 18th century France. The accession of the Last King, Stanislas August, just ten years

later, placed the seal of court approval on this new type of thought. The Royal Palace became the scene of the "Thursday Dinners," the atmosphere of the encyclopedists made itself felt everywhere. Building activities went on as before. The Palace was completely rebuilt, and the decorating of the reception rooms was entrusted to men like Baciarelli and Canaletto. The charming villa known as Lazienki was extended, and received its present form.

But something of far more importance happened. In 1765 a royal edict provided for "Commissions of a Better Order" for the tragically moribund cities of Poland—above all for the capital. There were two main problems: to get streets and buildings repaired and made worthy of a modern city, and to unite the whole community—completely sundered till now, under a single Town Council. The first was easier than the second. A scheme drawn up in 1767 failed, so strongly did the nobles defend their privileges; another of twelve years later got no farther. The Old Town proper did much to set its house in order, but the greater step was still to be taken. It came at the end of the eighties, thanks to the efforts of two burghers, Swiniarski and Dekert. Partly in keeping with the general stirring in Europe, partly with the efforts of the Four Year Diet, in particular of "The Forge" (the group of patriot leaders gathered around Kollataj), public sentiment was sufficiently roused to make possible the calling in 1789 of a Congress of Polish Towns. Cracow alone was not represented. There was more at stake than the local Warsaw conflict. At last the middle classes of the cities were united in a demand for the restoration of their economic and civil rights, of which for two centuries they had been deprived. The struggle was a long one, going on right through the winter. But it was carried through to a triumphal conclusion, and a charter of justice for the cities was incorporated in the Constitution of 3 May, 1791, still acclaimed as the dawning of modern Poland.

The closing years of the century brought for Warsaw, and for Poland as a whole, outward disaster but inward awakening. The failure of the Insurrection of Kosciuszko led to the Massacre of Praga, and to the Third Partition. This meant the collapse of the State; but it could not hinder the birth of the nation. Even as the union of the townsmen and the nobility in the capital made possible a healthier civic life, so the collaboration of patriots of every class opened the way for a truly national consciousness. From 1787 onward, Boguslawski had been making the theatre—drama and opera, a living force. Even earlier a modern press had come into being. The interest in books, especially in foreign publications, grew apace.

In 1801 the Society for the Promotion of Learning came into being, which was to secure a permanent home a few years later, thanks to the munificence of the scientist and patriot Sta-zic. As long as the war with Napoleon lasted, however, the city was bound to lead a beggarly existence. Its population fell to barely 60,000 souls.

For half a century a curiously conflicting and yet, in a way, collaborating set of forces had been at work in Warsaw. Along with the cosmopolitan influences, so characteristic of that age, there were unfolded national emotions and aspirations which justify the statement made above about the coming to birth of the true Polish spirit. This spirit made itself felt in many fields, but was not strong enough to save the State from disruption at the hands of imperialist neighbours. In the capital itself the Saxon period had left deep traces of German culture: a visible example of them was to be seen in the Lutheran church which was built on Krolewska Street. At the same time Russian influences, imposed from above, made themselves felt—notably in the circles of the aristocracy. Then, when the city came under Prussian dominion for a decade (1796–1806), a new kind of pressure was experienced. “Law and order” was introduced mostly by police methods—salutary enough, so far as it went; its chief aim being to root out every possible remainder of Russian control. Something was done for education and the theatre, still more for public health. The three visits of the Prussian royal pair, in 1798, 1802 and 1805, were sufficient proof of Berlin’s interest in “South Prussia.” (It was at this time that Christmas trees came into fashion, in town and country.) But these gains were offset by the withdrawal of the landed gentry from all part in the life of the capital: even the once famous “salons” became a dead letter. In any case the arrival on the scene of the French armies under the Emperor himself reversed the whole frame of things, and again French fashions and ideas were in the ascendancy. The Code Napoléon, the first permanent bridge across the Vistula, and an awakening intellectual life are to be noted. Yet no real revival of activities was possible under the shadow of war.

### III

After 1815 everything changed. Thanks to the high idealism of Tsar Alexander I and the energetic patronage of the Grand Duke Constantine, who had a Polish wife, a new era opened, with a dynamic quite unexpected. The material ruins of war-time were made good, imposing public buildings erected, sound economic controls instituted, and the population doubled in a decade. The



new Treasury, the Bank of Poland, the Grand Theatre—now the Opera, not to mention less pretentious additions, made the city look like a new place. The unsightly structures that cluttered up the space in front of the Castle were removed. The historian Niemcewicz, writing in 1818, was amazed at the progress already made in restoring the waste places. Cafés on all sides, nine book-stores—all with lending libraries, and nineteen printing establishments were counted. So great was the interest in music that thirty shops were busy producing instruments. Thirty-six piano masters, and fourteen teachers of the violin were registered. Small wonder that the young Chopin, coming from the country, found a congenial atmosphere in which to develop his talent. Distinguished visitors from abroad included Alexander von Humboldt, and the Danish sculptor Thorwaldsen. The latter came in 1825 to supervise the setting up of his bust of Copernicus in front of the Staszic Palace.

Now at last commerce and industry came into their own. The modest beginnings that had been made forty years before were resumed on a grander scale. To the university was added in 1825 a School of Engineering. These and kindred institutions were closed after the Rising of 1830-31, but industry—though slowed down for a while, soon pressed on to bigger things. Thanks chiefly to the courage and vision of Piotr Steinkeller the year 1837 can be called the birth-year of modern Polish industry. Warsaw furniture and machinery, leather and beer, paper and cutlery, soon became famous. Ten years later came that wonder of the modern world—the railway. The first linking up was with Vienna, and the west, but in time the east too was connected, and the whole Russian Empire was then found to be the best of markets for Polish manufactures.

Nevertheless the city could not yet develop on normal lines, and for a special reason. As punishment for the insurrection, the Russian overlords began in 1832 to build, just below the Old Town—part of which was cleared away to make room for it, the wholly unnecessary and much hated Citadel, whose guns were so placed as to overawe the city rather than defend it. A complete ring of fortifications to the west and south was added: this put an effective obstacle in the way of urban expansion, which lasted right down to 1915. Other marks of the reactionary Uvarov régime, of which Paskevich was a worthy pro-consul in Warsaw, were a throttling of all scientific and intellectual effort, a strict censure on the press, and a negative attitude toward all that been set down in the Constitution of 1815. Polish literature lived, but in exile. Only

one Review of note, *Biblioteka Warszawska*, founded in 1841, was able to survive.

With the crowning of a new Tsar, Alexander II, following the defeats of the Crimea, things looked more hopeful. True, on his first visit to Warsaw he used the significant phrase "point de reveries, Messieurs!"; but the nation saw signs of a milder regime. Two schools of thought and action grew up: that of the patriot Andrew Zamoyski, whose Agricultural Society was a sort of irregular Polish Diet, and that of Count Wielepolski, who was convinced that acceptance of and co-operation with St. Petersburg was the only wise policy. Thanks to his work as Minister of Education the *Szkoła Główna* was founded in 1858, with the eminent Mianowski as Rector, which had most of the earmarks of a university. During the few years of its existence, it trained not a few who were to stand out as national leaders—among them the lately deceased Alexander Swietochowski, and Henry Sienkiewicz.

The years were full of surprises in the capital. In 1859 the Iron Bridge was finished, at last uniting the Old Town with the suburb of Praga. The next year saw very serious rioting, the story of which was to be told later by no less a master than J. J. Kraszewski. Then came the ill-fated insurrection of 1863-64, and the succeeding years of depression. The hopes of the romantics were over, the turn of realism had come. Warsaw felt the influences of the Darwinian theory, of Comte's positivism, of the glorification of science—as we have it in Turgenev's *Fathers and Sons*. She looked on while Bismarck made himself master of the west, knowing that his new empire was allied to the Tsars all the time. There seemed to be nothing for it but to eschew politics henceforth, to turn to "organic work", and to build up the material wealth of the nation, as well as its mental and spiritual powers. In this Warsaw led the way.

The stern repressions associated with the name of Apuktin made themselves felt most in the cultural field, but they could not check private initiative in material things. Sons of noble families, dispossessed after '64 turned to the professions; notably to engineering, and to all departments of industry. With raw materials available, and with markets waiting, there was room for all. Hence the phenomenal growth of the cities of central Poland, Warsaw and Łódź. From less than a quarter of a million inhabitants in 1864, the capital rose to over half a million a generation later. One-third of them were Jews. By the outbreak of the war, the number had passed 800,000. Serious overcrowding resulted; a condition of affairs

that grew worse during the post war period, and has not even yet been properly mended

Such increase in population was bound far to outrun the provision of public utilities. Not till the eighties did Warsaw begin to instal proper water and sewage systems—the plans being those of the English engineer, Sir Henry Lindley. Already in 1856 the beginnings had been made with street-lighting with gas, and this continued for just fifty years, electricity being introduced from 1905. It was also in the fifties that the first horse-tram appeared, to provide a cross-town service between the west and the east railway terminals. Made more general in the eighties, these slow-moving vehicles were replaced in 1910 by a very up-to-date electric street railway—to which in recent years good buses have been added. Other needed utilities, such as good street paving, public markets, abattoirs and larger open spaces did come in time, but have lagged far behind the need. Typical of the perversity of things was the situation in regard to railway stations. The huge city had one small station, while the small suburb of Praga—facing Russia, had two large ones !

In the matter of churches and schools conditions were still worse. St. Cross Church, in the Cracow Faubourg, was the last to be built before the Partitions, and St. Alexander's in Three Crosses Square was the first to be added—after 1815. A long break followed, but at last a number of new ones were undertaken, to meet the acute need. Three stand out prominently : Our Saviour's at the end of Marshal Street, All Saints on Grybow Street, and St. Florian's across the river in Praga. For the use of Russian immigrants Orthodox churches were also built, chiefest among them being the massive Sobor on the central square in front of the Saxon Palace, with its campanile alongside. These were both dismantled a decade after the war. Symbolic of a foreign domination, their style of architecture offended the eye, being out of harmony with everything else ; and the public square was needed for other things.

As for schools, pre-1915 Warsaw was sadly lacking in them. The state schools were Russian ; private schools involved a heavy charge to build and maintain. Of these there were a few that would do credit to any capital, but the masses went untaught. Only under the German occupation could the beginnings be made of the Polish school system, and these were pushed forward when liberation came, with a view to meeting the swiftly growing needs of the country's chief city. Even today, partly owing to the recent years of depression, Warsaw is short of school rooms ; but the improvement in twenty-five years is immense.

Already before the war the Philharmonic Hall and the Public Art Gallery had taken their place as a part of the cultural heritage. From 1898 onwards, when the monument to the national poet-hero, Mickiewicz, was erected on the main thoroughfare, the citizens felt that at least a few of the things around them could be their own. In 1901 the Russians, using Polish money, added to the existing university a fine College of Engineering. This, and the imposing stone bridge over the Vistula were the most extensive single additions to the city's possessions in nearly a century.

Then followed the night-mare of the Great War, and after it two more years of anxiety until the Bolshevik invasion was thrown back in the autumn of 1920. During six long years the life of the city was at a stand-still. First Russian, then German armies passed and repassed; then came the strain of creation—almost out of nothing, the machinery of an independent state. The capital experienced days of gladness and of triumph, such as that on which Pilsudski returned from his prison at Magdeburg, to take up the duties of Chief of the State; but for one such there were long joyless and breadless intervals. My first sight of it was in February 1919; when for ten days I wandered about, talking with all sorts of people, seeing institutions of every kind, visiting homes of the poorest as well as of the well-to-do. The city was down at the heels. Not a drop of paint had been used for five years. The streets were in terrible condition, the housing shortage appalling. But the beginning of new things was at hand, and a brief survey of these must conclude this paper.

#### IV

Suddenly to become the centre of government and communications, as well as of the economic and cultural leadership of a people of 27,000,000, was an ordeal any city might shrink from. As an already over-crowded community of 900,000, it had to find room for vast numbers of newcomers, both for their living and their affairs; and the first years of this ordeal were a time of fearful dislocation. No visitor from outside could ever be sure of a bed to sleep in, and at most hours of the day the task of getting on or off a tram-car was a nightmare. Building did indeed begin very soon, but on a wholly inadequate scale. Further, it was years before the City Council, more or less caught napping by it all, could prepare proper plans, whether for the meeting of the housing distress or the making of the place into a capital worthy of a sovereign state. Special needs stood out, to which special attention had to be given.

i. The creation of residential suburbs, both for the relatively well-to-do and for the poorer classes; which would be at least hygienic and within reach of the job. In terms of one decade only, this meant providing room for at least 250,000 new inhabitants.

ii. The taking-in-hand of the Old Town and its vicinity, parts of which had never been attached to the city water-works, and all of which was in the hands of a backward Jewish population, numbering one-third of all the people in the capital; with a view to transforming not only its living conditions but also its outward appearance.

iii. The supervision of such building as private agencies were carrying on, to make it safe for the neighbourhood and to ensure decency in style.

iv. The erection of vitally needed public buildings, from schools and health centres to a useable railway station, a National Mint, a National Museum and an adequate bridge over the Vistula river. To which should be added playgrounds for hordes of children, proper parks and marketing facilities, increased services for water, light and power, etc.

It was well that the men on whom these responsibilities devolved had both skill and daring. What is more, they knew that to be useful a thing need not necessarily be ugly. Fortunately the wide open lands around the city, on both sides of the river, provide the needed *terrain*; while the Vistula itself, with its steeper left bank, offers possibilities of landscaping not unfavourable for beauty.

It would be tedious to recount even the chief stages of this reconditioning program, or to set forth the progress made in new construction. Suffice it to say that Warsaw has been transformed in a decade, and that in the next ten years even more is promised. A specially arranged Exhibition "The Warsaw of the Future," showed an astonished public in 1936 the main lines followed. Zoning, in order to sort out the industrial and business from the residential areas. Street-planning on a vast scale, which would secure cross-town transportation for the crowds to be moved night and morning (until such time as an Underground can relieve the burden). Landscaping, in particular of the river banks and the "skarpy," as they are called, where the clearing away of hundreds of shacks and hovels of all kinds makes possible lawn and garden spaces, as well as playgrounds and boulevards. Finally, provision for something Warsaw has never had, a quarter set apart for special demonstrations, such as the celebration of national holidays—what the *Champs Elysées* are for Paris; whose care will be more that of the republic as a whole than of the city. In all this the new science of town planning

has been explored to the full, in particular the results obtained sixty years or more ago when Vienna and Paris were turned into modern capitals. The results are a matter of time.

Ten years ago the medieval houses still standing on the Old Town Square were given back their one-time coat of polychrome decorations. The beloved Staszic Palace was restored to the form in which it was built. Later came the laying out of fine lawns and avenues all around the Citadel, the centre of which is represented by the Place of Execution—something dearer to the nation even than the tomb of the unknown soldier. Broad steps lead up to the spot, rising from the spacious Embankment Avenues, and the view across the expanse of the Vistula, nearly half a mile at this point, is one not soon forgotten. Among the most impressive achievements has been the building of the fine Museum, just beside the approach of the Poniatowski Bridge. Below it, on the broad flats, is still standing a complex of ugly barracks. These are now to go, and in their place new buildings and gardens will give the district a different tone.

As things are going, Warsaw is bound to grow much faster than it should. Lesseps said of it that in half a century it would be the biggest railway junction in Europe. This was an exaggeration; but something of this sort is unavoidable owing to its geographical position. With a million and a quarter inhabitants today, there is little doubt that in another twenty years it will be approaching two millions. Knowing this, the City Council has given special attention to suburban communications; so that people can live twenty miles out and still get regularly to work. For the same reason it has secured two important waste woodland areas to the north and west, each of which has tiny lakes; by way of creating in time accessible recreation grounds for those who cannot afford to go farther afield for holidays. Extensive forests east of the Vistula, lying close to the city, are a distinct asset; and so far as possible they will be saved from the axe of the destroyer.

## V

But there is something else during the past year, which has come to light to gladden and warm the hearts of loyal Varsovians. Tentative soundings along the semi-circle of streets that marked in early times the defences of the Old Town, convinced those interested that excavations made in a judicious manner,—involving of course the buying out and taking away of a certain number of old houses, might bring to light secrets of Medieval Warsaw that have been hidden for ages. Work was begun and the summer of 1938 has

brought astonishing results. The history of Warsaw has been carried back by a century, and the imagination stirred to an interest in the past, for thousands who cared about nothing save their business and their beer.

Two hundred yards of ancient wall, rising from four to five metres above the street level, and surrounded by a moat nearly as deep, have been laid bare, and will now be preserved and made accessible to the public for inspection. A tiny garden is being created along it, with seats for visitors, where one can slip aside from the bustle of modern world and commune with the past. At one end of this *sanctum* is the New Town Bridge, spanning the moat, and revealing in part the outer barbican that guarded it. Half of this has been excavated; the rest will be done when funds are available. Enough of the arching supporting the bridge was preserved to make the reconstruction of the balance an exact one. Half way along the wall—(actually there were two of them, the inner rising a couple of metres higher than the outer), was a Round Tower, deep under which has been revealed a vault for the keeping of kegs of powder. Along the wall runs a gallery for the watchmen, such as can be seen in New College gardens in Oxford, or in York.

These discoveries, which will doubtless lead to others no less interesting, have a significance that reaches far beyond the Old Town itself. As the reader will have seen, there has been a tendency in parts of Poland to look upon Warsaw as a modern city; as a capital that came into its own very late in history: much in the same way as older cities of Germany look upon Berlin as something new and not too refined. At least a good part of this "reproach" is now being removed. As we saw, organised institutions existed here before 1300. The excavations show that by this time the city had its wall; so the inference is that a relatively long period of civic life must have preceded these fairly ambitious enterprises.

For the visitor from abroad what has happened is of special interest. Another link is forged by these discoveries in the contacts of business and national interests joining the busy doings along the Baltic—the cities of Danzig, and Toruń,—to the ancient settlements under the Carpathians in the heart of Europe. It is only a matter of time, when we shall read the Book of the Vistula as a whole, many pages of which have been torn out and hidden away. When that time comes, the river will take its place beside the Rhine, the Rhone and others like them, as one of the great highways of European culture.

WILLIAM J. ROSE.

## MAXIM GORKY

### IN SEARCH OF A SYNTHESIS

FROM the very outset Maxim Gorky showed a desire to be not only an artist but also a teacher. During the forty-five years of his literary activity he composed, in addition to the twenty odd volumes of fiction, drama, and memoirs, a quantity of essays, editorials, and speeches on various subjects. It is primarily as publicist and literary critic, both in the press and in his voluminous correspondence, that Gorky displayed his tendency not only to create but also to explain and exhort, to label and pass judgment. As a self-made and self-educated man, he formed his views, especially his theoretical views, laboriously, and with much vacillation and groping. A case in point is his attitude toward Realism and Romanticism.

Gorky records a remark by Tolstoy : " As to Romanticism, that comes from one's fear to look truth straight in the eye."<sup>1</sup> Gorky's early writings, naive flights into the legendary and fantastic, did betray such a fear on the part of one who more than any of his fellow-writers had gazed into the eye of factual truth. He had just emerged from the lower depths of life, his bruises from contact with the reality of stevedores and tramps were still raw, and his first ventures with the pen had a decidedly escapist air. Korolenko, whose mentorship and guidance Gorky fully acknowledged in later days, was keen enough to detect a genuine robustness beneath the hyperbolic veneer of the beginner. On reading Gorky's " Old Woman Izergil," Korolenko observed :

" A queer tale ! Why, it is Romanticism, which has been dead for a long time. I doubt very much whether this Lazarus deserves resurrecting. It seems to me that you are singing in the wrong key. You are a Realist, not a Romanticist. You are a Realist."<sup>2</sup>

Korolenko persuaded Gorky to write from his actual observations and experiences. He was delighted to publish in his review Gorky's first realistic story, " Chelkash." Gorky recalls that on that occasion Korolenko remarked :

" You see, I've told you that you are a Realist ! " Then he paused, and added with a grin : " But at the same time a Romanticist ! "<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> " Lev Tolstoy." *Sobranie sochineniy*, V., XVI, p. 278 (Kniga).

<sup>2</sup> " V. G. Korolenko." *Ibid.*, pp. 221-22.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 226.



Indeed, the opening paragraph of "Chelkash" was written in the upper notes of Gorky's early rhapsodies. For years to come Gorky retained the duality noticed by Korolenko. One recalls how often Chekhov drew his attention to the discrepancy between the realistic contents of his stories and the lack of reserve in his descriptive passages and in the choice of words<sup>4</sup>. Along with his stories from every-day life, written in the traditional vein of Russian Realism, Gorky proceeded to publish spicy allegories, such as "The Song of the Falcon," "The Song of the Stormy Petrel," written in a declamatory metric prose.

This duality appeared even more striking in his journalistic articles and in some private letters of the period preceding 1905. As a feuilletonist on several newspapers in the Volga region during the late 1890's, Gorky now championed the Realism of Balzac, now the poetry of the early Russian Symbolists, Balmont and Bryusov, now the ultra-Impressionism of the painter Vrubel. In January, 1901, he agreed to contribute to the Symbolist miscellany, *Northern Flowers*, telling in a letter to Bryusov of his desire to support the maligned Symbolists, since they were treated like "literary outcasts."<sup>5</sup> But one month later, after the inauguration by the authorities of drastic measures against university students, including forced recruitment into the army as privates, Gorky refused to have any commerce with those who dwell in an ivory tower. In a note to the same Bryusov he vehemently protested against the indifferentism, aloofness and preciosity of the Symbolist group, reproaching even his Realist friend, Ivan Bunin, for not whetting his fine talent into a dagger.<sup>6</sup>

About the same time Gorky was expressing his admiration for Anton Chekhov, both in his published articles and in his letters to the older author. He took issue with the leading critics of the time, notably Mikhailovsky, who accused Chekhov of being cold and devoid of any "message." He praised Chekhov's "humane objectivity," his realistic portrayal of life, his "unembellished" individuals, and the implied social message of his picture of wingless actuality.<sup>7</sup> But in a letter to Chekhov, written almost simultaneously, Gorky said.

Have read your "Lady with the Dog." Do you know what you are doing? You are slaying Realism. And you

<sup>4</sup> Especially in his letters to Gorky, of 3 December, 1898, and of 3 January, 1899, in *Pis'ma A. P. Chekhova*, V. V, pp. 477-78 and 480.

<sup>5</sup> Letter to Bryusov, 12 January, 1901, in *Pechat' i Revoliutsia*, 1928—V, p. 56.

<sup>6</sup> Letter to Bryusov, 5 February, 1901, *ibid.*, pp. 56-57.

<sup>7</sup> *Nizhegorodsky Listok*, 29 February, 1900.

will slay it pretty soon, you will murder it, and for good. Realism has outlived its time, that's a fact. No one can follow this path beyond you, no one can write so simply about such simple things as you know how to do. After any of your stories, however insignificant, everything else appears crude, as though written not by a pen but by a cudgel. . . . So there, you are going to dispatch Realism. I rejoice at this exceedingly. Enough of it! To the devil with it!

Truly, at this moment one feels the need of heroics: there is a common desire for stimulating, brilliant things, for something, you know, that is not like life, but higher than life, better, more beautiful. It is absolutely necessary for present day literature to begin embellishing life a bit, and as soon as it begins to do so, life will take on colour; I mean men will begin to live a quickened, a brighter life . . .<sup>8</sup>

In his last years, as we shall see, Gorky will emphasise and reiterate the need of "heroics," with clarity and conviction. In 1900, however, when he wrote this letter, he was neither clear nor articulate in his views. He knew Russian life intimately; but he felt that the mere presentation of its seamy sides was insufficient at a time when the average citizen needed encouragement for a heroic struggle against the obsolescent order. Chekhov, too, expected the writer not only "to show life as it is," but also to make the reader "feel life as it ought to be."<sup>9</sup> But while Chekhov remained to the end a detached observer, Gorky lent an active hand to the task of reshaping life "as it ought to be" — he helped the revolutionary movement with his pen and his money, and paid the customary price of a Russian non-conformist—prison and exile. In his creative writings, however, Gorky continued to vacillate. Each of his first plays, *Smug Citizens* and *The Lower Depths*, along with their realistic treatment of everyday scenes and persons, contains an adumbration of man as he ought to be (voiced by the workman Nil and the "ex-man" Satin, respectively). The old vagabond Luka, in *The Lower Depths*, disconcerted the audiences and the critics: was he meant as a positive or as a negative character? A liar and a cheat,

\* Letter to Chekhov, January (date not given), 1900, "Pis'ma M. Gor'kovo k A. P. Chekhovu," in *M. Gorky, Materialy i issledovaniya*, V. II, p. 186. Akademia Nauk, 1936.

<sup>9</sup> "The best of the world writers are realistic and they show life as it is, but in addition to that they possess a very significant peculiarity: they go somewhere, and they call you to the same place. And because each line of theirs is saturated with the consciousness of an aim, you feel, besides life as it is, also life as it ought to be" . . .

Quoted by N. Bogoslovsky in *Krasnaya Nov'*, November, 1936, p. 144.

he wove illusions for his listeners in the dank and gloomy cellar, and he did sweeten their misery, if only for a brief space. Subsequently Gorky denied his sympathy for Luka, but readers and spectators are tempted to take him as a protagonist of the Romanticism of falsehood, of the "*Als ob*" philosophy. About the same time Gorky wrote his rhapsody "Man," a hymn to the potential man, free from illusions and fears, advancing with the aid of Reason "ever forward! ever higher!" This was decidedly "as it ought to be," rather than "as it is."

Balzac attracted Gorky both at the beginning of his career and at the very end of his life.<sup>10</sup> How far did he follow in the footsteps of the Frenchman? Georges Sand records a conversation she once had with Balzac, in the course of which she expressed her wish to compose a "roman humain" as against his "comédie humaine" "En somme," she concluded, "vous voulez et savez peindre l'homme tel qu'il est sous vos yeux, soit! Moi, je me sens porté à le peindre tel que je souhaite qu'il soit, tel que je crois qu'il doit être."<sup>11</sup> This is perhaps too neat a demarcation, but it is clear and brief enough to be adopted in this case. To be sure, the line of demarcation between those two methods of portrayal is often blurred in Gorky, for not infrequently he follows both Balzac and Sand in one and the same work. Definitely, however, the Sand note predominated in such of his novels as *Mother*, *Summer* and *The Confession*, written shortly after the revolution of 1905. In the nascent revolutionary proletariat Gorky saw a promise for the realisation of his ideal Man; all he had to do was to expand his faith in the individual man into a faith in collective humanity. Despite his vast experience and heartbreaking disappointments in his fellow-men, Gorky cultivated that faith stubbornly, and lived to see it partially fulfilled under the Soviet régime. In the novels just mentioned one is aware of a poetisation, of a certain idealisation of the individuals and groups intended by the author to illustrate his faith. We have seen how after praising Chekhov's unembellished characters, Gorky pleaded with him for the need of "embellishment", this Romantic tenet he will uphold in his later years. Speaking of the novelist's mission, Georges Sand suggests that "Son but devrait être de faire aimer les

<sup>10</sup> Toward the end of Chapter IX, *In the World* (I am referring to the original, *V lyudyakh*), Gorky records his impression of the first "genuine" book, *Eugénie Grandet*. It was a revelation to him that the truth of life could be shown in "an entirely new light." In the collection of his last articles and speeches one often comes on the name of Balzac, invariably mentioned with admiration.

<sup>11</sup> *Le Compagnon du tour de France*, V. II. Notice.

objets de sa sollicitude, et au besoin, je ne lui ferais pas un reproche de les embellir un peu."<sup>12</sup>

It can hardly be disputed that Gorky is more in his element in his efforts at a "comédie humaine" than when attempting a "roman humain." That he himself became conscious of this is evident from his later development. Beginning with his first masterpiece, *Childhood*, and to the very end, he seldom swerved from *Wahrheit* in favour of *Dichtung*. In his autobiographical novels, stories and sketches, in such of his plays as *Enemies* and the unfinished trilogy (the first two being *Egor Bulychev* and *Dostigayev*), in the masterly canvass of provincial Russia, *Matvey Kozhemyakin* and *Okurov Town*, in *The Artamonov Business* (*Decadence*) and the incomplete tetralogy, *The Life of Klim Samgin*, the Balzac note rings supreme. Only occasionally, in the author's asides or in an obvious "embellishment," does the later Gorky display a recrudescence of the George Sand approach.

When we turn again to Gorky, the publicist and critic, we find that his theoretical views were gradually taking a more distinct shape in the years following the revolution of 1905. Close contact with the revolutionary movement, and specifically his friendship (however wavering) with the leaders of the Bolshevik faction, Lenin, Lunacharsky, Bogdanov, Krasin, and others, definitely coloured his outlook, even though he never quite mastered Marxian dialectics. The transition from the extreme individualism of his early tales to the collective humanism of his *Mother* and *Confession*, marks a significant roadpost on his evolutionary path. In his non-fiction writings he was, of course, more outspoken. His articles for the period 1905-16 are a militant challenge to prevailing social conditions on the one hand and an advocacy of aggressive Realism in art on the other. These two aspects of his essays are fully co-ordinated and fused. In his preface to the collection of these papers we read:

The meaning of my twenty-five year long work, as I understand it, may be summed up in my passionate desire to arouse in men an active attitude toward life.<sup>13</sup>

Russian passivity was to Gorky the source of all evil, the "Asia" of his nation's "two souls."<sup>13</sup> He attacked vehemently the traditional tendencies of Russian literature, which he regarded as furthering that Asian trait. There was no "active attitude" in

<sup>12</sup> *La mare au diable. Preface.*

<sup>13</sup> *Stat'i* 1905-1916, 2nd edition. Petrograd, 1918.

the "superfluous men," the gentry of Pushkin, Lermontov, Herzen, or Turgenev, nor in Goncharov's Oblomov, the personification of Russian indolence, nor in the hyper-introspective individuals of Dostoyevsky and Tolstoy "All our literature," he wrote in 1905, "persistently teaches a passive attitude toward life; it is an apologia for passivity"<sup>14</sup> Although he later modified this sweeping statement, he reiterated his belief in the pernicious influence of Dostoyevsky and Tolstoy. The slogan of Dostoyevsky, "Humble thyself, proud man!"<sup>15</sup>, and Tolstoy's doctrine of non-resistance and individual self-perfection, were apt to paralyse the public will to action at a time when, according to Gorky, all efforts should have been concentrated on rousing the collective fighting spirit against the existing order.

At this time Gorky uses the term "Romanticism" as synonymous with Reactionism, as a mood resulting from weariness and despair, and as an escape from contemporary reality. In support of this view he quotes from Novalis, Chateaubriand, the Schlegel brothers, and other "individualists divorced from life," as distinguished from Schiller, Byron, Hugo, whose "social Romanticism" has been "the Holy Writ of the genius of active life."<sup>16</sup> Disenchantment and fear of reality lead to self-centred Individualism, to preoccupation with one's personal ills and doubts, to that exaggerated introspection which Gorky deplored in his fellow-writers—contemporary and those of the past. "The basis of Romanticism is a morbidly developed awareness of one's Ego,"<sup>17</sup> hence he applies this label to Dostoyevsky, whose characters, in their passion for self-assertion, declare the absolutism of personal will and whim. Referring to Dostoyevsky's *Notes from Underground*, Gorky thus generalises:

This sermon of unbridled and unlimited self-will hides in its depths the despair of an individual incapable of communing with the world and severed from it; it is the anarchism of despondency—the characteristic mood of Romanticists. The

<sup>14</sup> "Two souls," *ibid.*, 174-87.

<sup>15</sup> "Notes on Philistinism," *ibid.*, p. 6.

<sup>16</sup> In his speech on Pushkin, 20 June, 1880, reprinted in *Dnevnik pisatelya*, 1880.

<sup>17</sup> "Two Souls," p. 183.

By 1932 Gorky must have changed his view. Allowing that "social heroism" may be regarded as Romanticism, he made this qualification. "But, of course, one must not confuse this Romanticism with that of Schiller, Hugo, and the Symbolists" "About Plays," in *O Literature*, p. 157. The "Holy Writ" apparently applied only to Byron.

conviction of the individual's right to unlimited self-will opens for the Romanticist, on the one hand, the road to undisciplined anarchism, and on the other it inevitably leads him to the idealisation of autocracy, of monarchism.<sup>18</sup>

During that period of disintegration, between two revolutions, Gorky waged a bitter fight against the literary tendencies then in vogue—decadent formalism, pessimism, and a cynicism resulting in naturalism, pornography, and solipsism. Now that his own talent had matured and found expression in his autobiographical stories, and his social views had ripened and formulated, he had no patience with the sick lassitude of Russian literature, which, retrospectively, may appear to us to have been the natural expression of a moribund order. In his letters at that time he pleaded for a healthy optimism, a note least to be expected from one who had revealed life's discouraging features, and who bore the pen-name of "Gorky"—the Bitter. As editor of the *Znanie* miscellanies, he refused to print any *fin de siècle* pieces. Explaining to David Aizman, one of his numerous protégés, why he rejected a story by him, he wrote :

My attitude toward pessimism and all other expressions of psychic degeneracy in Russian literature is growing ever more hostile. . . . In a land as young as Russia, in a people that is just beginning to live, pessimism is a noxious element, and to me it is a product of the disintegration of an individual who is devoid of the sense of his organic unity with the world, and is therefore perishing . . . .

. . . I am sick and tired of subjectivism. I have nothing in common with one who perpetually groans, weeps, denies, underlines the horrible and the cruel, failing to see behind isolated manifestations of the struggle for life the grand process of its mighty growth, the gradual emergence of a collective *psyche*, the organising of world-wide experience into a force that will demolish all obstacles standing in the way of the great cause of building a new life.<sup>19</sup>

The Realist Gorky, who had seen "in life not less but more filth, falsehood, and all manner of nastiness than Artsybashev, Andreyev and Sologub put together,"<sup>20</sup> was greatly chagrined by the waxing Romantic pessimism of his erstwhile friend, Leonid

<sup>18</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 181.

<sup>19</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>20</sup> Letter to D. Aizman, 21 April, 1908, "Pis'ma M. Gorkovo k D. Aizmanu," in *Materialy i issledovaniya*, v. II, pp. 341-42.

Andreyev About 1912 (the letter is not dated), he wrote to him, in not too genteel a manner

To display for the world one's scars, to scratch them in public and ooze their pus, to spurt one's gall into people's eyes as many are doing today, and as our evil genius, Fedor Dostoyevsky, had done most disgustingly, is an infamous occupation, and certainly a harmful one.

We shall all die, the world will go on. It, the world, has shown me and forced on me much evil and filth, but I do not want and do not accept its abominations. . . Why poison people with the degrading sight of my wounds and sores, why deafen them with my screams?<sup>21</sup>

. . . Contemporary writers have of late become particularly revolting in that they walk about publicly without trousers and hind foremost, sorrowfully showing the world their aching spot. That spot aches because it does not know where to sit down quietly.<sup>22</sup>

Having no illusions about his fellow-men, Gorky nevertheless continued to cherish his love for Man—with a capital M. "Man is still my point of insanity," he wrote to Andreyev. "Even when I upbraid him I cannot help admiring him—a splendid beast! If only he were not so lazy, and if he only understood the beauty of movement!"<sup>23</sup> Addressing a whining correspondent (name unknown), who apparently could not cope with life's "accursed questions," Gorky spoke of his own experience:

Here I am, a man of forty-four. My life began very hard, and has continued to be hard to this day, for "painful is the position of a Russian writer," and neither "fame" nor anything else can mollify the grief, the fear and shame for Russia, which I believe every honestly thinking and feeling man must experience.

Indeed, I am afraid for men, and pained and ashamed for them too, yet my faith in man's basic goodness and its eventual triumph does not fail me.

Why? Because I know men. I have seen quantities of them, in various situations, in sorrow and joy, I've seen them bad and good, funny and miserable, in the mud and on

<sup>21</sup> Tolstoy remarked: "Andreyev shouts: Boo! But I am not scared."

<sup>22</sup> "From Far Away," in *Stat'i* 1905-1916, p. 147.

<sup>23</sup> Letter to Andreyev, end of 1911 or early in 1912, "*Pis'ma M. Gorkovo k L. Andreyevu*," in *Materialy i issledovaniya*, v. I, pp. 154-55.

heights—and in the last account, out of all the things I know about them, I have kept for them in my heart a fine, unshakable feeling.<sup>24</sup>

This optimism of Gorky was based on his conviction that life's ugliness and vulgarity, which he knew and exposed so poignantly, were not inherent but conditioned. "Remove," he cried, "the class struggle, which upholds man's zoological instincts of greed, fear, malice; abolish social inequality," and mankind will prove the "inexhaustible source of its creative power."<sup>25</sup> His faith in the collective intelligence of the race, and in its ability to profit from experience, grew stronger with the passing of the years. Shortly before the world war, the coming of which he felt and predicted as "a bloody nightmare" bound to provoke "a savage explosion of zoological instincts,"<sup>26</sup> he had the courage to write these rhapsodic lines:

Man is the flaming peak of the enormous pyramid of experience; the broader its base, the more does he absorb of that vital experience, and the brighter and more beautiful his unquenchable flame. Man deserves idealisation. Many fine legends will be told about us by our descendants, according to how well we burn and how brilliant the memories we leave behind us.<sup>27</sup>

It follows from the quoted examples that his own optimism about the future of humanity, his faith in man's inherent goodness and in his being worthy of idealisation, Gorky did not regard as Romanticism. In any case, not as reactionary Romanticism. This recurrence of an old discrepancy in his views will appear, however, more as a case of using old terms for a new idea, when we take up Gorky's writings of the final period, 1928-36. The years 1917-28 may be omitted, since his articles of that time, collected as *Revolution and Culture*, *Thoughts out of Season*, and *On Guard*, were for the most part bitter polemics, against both the Bolsheviks and their opponents; they hardly touch on literary issues. With his return to the Soviet Union, in 1928, for the fortieth anniversary of his literary career, Gorky entered on the last and most exuberant phase of his life. For the first time he found himself in agreement with an existing order, and the man who "had come into this world—to disagree"

<sup>24</sup> Letter to Andreyev, undated; probably autumn, 1911. *Ibid.*, p. 150.

<sup>25</sup> Letter to Unknown, undated; probably 1912 or 1913. *Ibid.*, p. 336.

<sup>26</sup> "From Far Away," p. 148.

<sup>27</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 100.



and advocate of Socialist Realism, I shall follow his line of thought and endeavour to elucidate, rather than criticise, the evolution of his views towards this climactic stage.

Socialist Realism Gorky regards, by implication, as the synthesis of Realism and Romanticism, as he defines them. Realism is to him "the truthful, unembellished portrayal of men and the conditions of their life."<sup>28</sup> He considers it "the broadest and most fruitful literary current of the 19th century, overflowing into the 20th as well."<sup>29</sup> Realists have for the most part been "prodigal sons of the bourgeoisie"<sup>29</sup> who have outgrown their environment, and treated it critically. This is therefore Critical Realism, its main purpose being the exposition of life's negative sides. Unable to suggest a way out, finding no affirmations save that of "the utter senselessness of social life and of existence in general."<sup>29</sup> it was natural for this school to assume a pessimistic hue. "The basic and main theme of 19th century literature has been the individual's pessimistic consciousness of the infirmity of his social existence. Schopenhauer, Hartmann, Leopardi, Stirner and many other thinkers have supported this consciousness by preaching life's cosmic meaninglessness. This doctrine was based, of course, on the same consciousness of the individual's social defencelessness, social loneliness. Under the new reality that is being created by the proletariat-dictator of the Soviet Union, the individual, even when lost in the icy desert of the Arctic, living every minute under the threat of death, does not feel lonely and helpless."<sup>29</sup>

To this critical and pessimistic Realism Gorky contrasts two varieties of Romanticism, passive and active. The former "attempts either to reconcile man with reality, by embellishing it, or to draw him away from reality to fruitless probing of his inner world, to thoughts about 'life's fatal riddles' . . . Active Romanticism strives to intensify man's will to life, and rouse him to rebellion against reality and whatever oppresses it."<sup>28</sup> This active tendency Gorky finds blended with Realism in such writers as Balzac, Turgenev, Tolstoy, and other "classics," from "Gogol to Chekhov and Bunin": "This fusion of Romanticism and Realism is especially characteristic of our Russian [literature], lending it that originality and force which have been influencing world literature ever more perceptibly and deeply."<sup>28</sup> One may infer that Dostoyevsky, Andreyev, and other "introspectionists" are to be relegated to the limbo of passive

<sup>28</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 148.

<sup>29</sup> "How I learned to Write," in *O Literature. Stat'i i rech.*, 1928-36. 3rd edition, 1937. Pp 199-227 *passim*

Romanticists, those who "draw man away from reality." What about Tolstoy after his "conversion"? Though extremely vital, this question is outside the scope of my paper.

Socialist Realism differs from both critical Realism and active Romanticism, (and their fusion), in that it is neither prevailingly negative, nor provocative of rebellion against existing conditions. On the contrary, it is largely constructive and affirmative, both in portraying the new man and his achievements, and in visioning his progress. Thus, unlike the other schools, which are prevailingly pessimistic, Socialist Realism is imbued with optimism towards the present and the future. Even these general terms render the definition of a living and growing literature Procrustean. Gorky, always groping and shaky in the realm of abstractions and formulas, does not hesitate to shuffle old terms in order to make his new ideas clear. Above all he endeavours to draw a sharp line between the old and the new time and again emphasises that literary schools are characteristic of given environments. Just as critical Realism reflects conditions of capitalistic society, so does Socialist Realism adequately represent Soviet society. This is evident in the treatment of the individual for one thing. The conflict of the individual with society and its established institutions, has been the leading motive in world literature. Only in Soviet literature does one face the new individual not as an antithesis to society, but as one whose aspirations and attainments coincide with the welfare of the collective whole. One of the oldest dramatic conflicts is eliminated from life and art.

Since Gorky's own art dealt with old Russia, and primarily portrayed its negative sides, it must be relegated, if we follow his terminology, to the field of critical Realism. Gorky repeatedly pays homage to the contributions of this school, but for the purposes of present-day Russia he advocates its confinement to "the illumination of the survivals of the past, for the sake of waging war against them and eradicating them."<sup>30</sup> The Soviet writer must reckon with three "realities": "the past, whence derive all premisses; the present, which is battling against the past; the future, already visible in general outline,"<sup>31</sup> In his preface (the number of his prefaces and introductions to new works is legion) to a book of Soviet verse, he further differentiated the treatment of periods, by expecting the writer to be "a satirist in regard to the past, a merciless Realist

<sup>30</sup> "Talk with Young Writers," *ibid.*, pp. 315-29 *passim*.

<sup>31</sup> Speech at the Congress of Soviet Writers, August, 1934. *Ibid.*, p. 471.

toward the present, and a Romanticist in his anticipation of the future and its appraisal."<sup>32</sup> Old terms once again, but the author's ideas behind them become clearer as we follow him.

Though always a "merciless Realist" in exposing the objectionable features of the present, Gorky has dreamed for years of the potential Man, liberated from the thralldom of economic mastery-slavery. In abolishing the exploitation of man by man, and in proclaiming the principle of a classless society, the revolution has translated Gorky's dream into reality. After the first few years of misgivings and vacillations, Gorky ultimately embraced the new order without reservations. Instead of singing rhythmic hymns to Man of the future, he now expresses in prose his admiration for the Russian common man who has conquered one-seventh of the globe and swept it clean of age-old excrescences. His prose is more convincing because it is pragmatic, almost empirical. When he writes of the gigantic strides of the Russian masses towards the transformation of physical geography and human nature, he describes actuality, though a short while ago he would have sounded fantastic.

Young people may find it funny, when I, an old man, must confess that I am writing at present in the state of mind which at the dawn of culture enabled our forbears to create evergreen poems and legends. Yes, I am writing precisely in such a state of mind, and it depresses me greatly to realise that I lack words equal in force to the force of the facts which arouse in my heart so much joy and pride at the marvellous achievements of our proletariat dictator.<sup>33</sup>

Here is the tragedy of an author who has lived to see his dream fulfilled, but finds his talent too "critical" and negative to do it justice. All he can do is to exhort the young authors to observe and record artistically what he can only admire at the sunset of his days. Such a record, he feels, does not lend itself to the literary methods of the old order. Commenting on the construction of the White Sea-Baltic canal by thousands of lawbreakers, who were let loose in a vast territory and enabled to rehabilitate themselves as responsible builders, Gorky spoke of the transformation of "wreckers, *kulaks*, thieves," and other enemies of society when placed before a great and competitive task:

Now the enemy loomed up before them as the unorganised, elemental force of turbulent rivers, as granite rocks and quaggy bogs. This enemy could be conquered only by the organised energy of human collectives. And

<sup>32</sup> "Two Pyatiletkas," *ibid.*, p. 409.

<sup>33</sup> Y. Virtanen's verses, 1933, p. 6.

behold, the men became convinced with their own eyes of the creative, all-conquering power of collective labour. Harnessing rivers like horses to work for man, many of the "enemies of society" realised that they were working for the enrichment and happiness of a family of 160 million units. It is permissible for a writer to imagine that many of the former enemies had come to feel not as the petty proprietors and exploiters they had been, but as masters of immeasurable forces and treasures of the whole earth. To feel thus, means to grow above and beyond all the heroes of all peoples and ages.

Is this Romanticism? Hardly, comrades. I think that this is, indeed, Socialist Realism, the Realism of men who are changing, rebuilding the world, realistic thought and imagery based on socialistic experience<sup>34</sup>

The change of method derives from the change of conditions—this becomes the refrain of Gorky's later utterances. "For the first time in the history of mankind, Russian workers and peasants, having conquered the power over their country, have won the right to change reality according to their interests, the right to build a State on the basis of economic equality, a State in which there must be no idlers, parasites, exploiters, and preachers of a morality that represses man."<sup>35</sup> Five years later, referring to the striking abundance of talent displayed in every phase of Russian life, he wrote: "The basic aspiration of our talents is toward the bold aim of fundamentally transforming all conditions of life, and building a new world"<sup>36</sup> He repeatedly expressed his chagrin at the failure of Soviet literature to reflect the magnitude of the changes in life. So bewildering and multifarious have been the events of the last twenty years that most of the writers have been unable to see the forest for the multitude of trees. Traditional Russian Realism was found wanting when applied to a period of storm and stress. "Epic" and "heroic" are the epithets often used by Gorky when speaking of Soviet life: "Our life demands heroic poetry"<sup>37</sup>; "Our literature faces the extremely difficult task of creating by realistic methods an epic art which shall fully reflect the heroism of the working class, the builder of a new society."<sup>38</sup> If this be so, Realism must be changed, or discarded. On one occasion Gorky admitted that "our new life cannot be encompassed by the methods of Realism. These methods fail to suggest the pathos of our reality. Realism and pathos cannot be combined."<sup>39</sup>

Gorky wages a battle against the mere recording of visible facts in so much of Soviet fiction. The old quarrel as to whether the

<sup>34</sup> "Hillock and Point," *O Literature*, p. 176.

<sup>35</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 177-78.

<sup>36</sup> "About 'Little' Men and their Great Work," *ibid.*, p. 35.

<sup>37</sup> "Hillock and Point," p. 179.

<sup>38</sup> "About the 'Poet's Library,'" *ibid.*, p. 97.

<sup>39</sup> "There is no Place for Indifference," *ibid.*, p. 113.

writer must describe life as it is, or as it ought to be, is revived. In Gorky's opinion, the new Realism, in regarding man in the process of evolution from "ancient, philistine, animal individualism toward socialism, should portray him not only as he is today, but also as he ought—and shall—be tomorrow."<sup>40</sup> Here the note of George Sand sounds clear and definite. The fetishism of facts, of "reality," irks Gorky

I am not a Naturalist. Literature, I maintain, must rise above reality, must in a measure look from the top down upon it, because the task of literature is not limited to the reflection of reality. It is not enough to depict that which is, one must remember that which is desirable and possible. It is necessary to typify phenomena. The problem of literature is to take small but characteristic phenomena and make out of them large and typical phenomena. If you take the great works of the 19th century, you will find that that is what literature aspired to and what it splendidly achieved in the hands of great masters—Balzac, for instance . . .<sup>41</sup>

In this passage Gorky wipes out the dichotomy so sharply drawn by George Sand between her method and that of Balzac; here the two are blended into one. He becomes more and more impatient with the adherence of the young writers to the factual representation of life: "We are concerned with the exact portrayal of that which is, only in so far as we need that for a deeper and better understanding of all the things which we are obliged to uproot, and of all the things which we must create. A heroic cause demands heroic words."<sup>42</sup> In its dramatism and tempo, Soviet life bursts the confines of established criteria and methods. He admonishes the young authors to rise above methods, when necessary: "If the methods of Realism prevent you from depicting the hero of our epoch in the light he deserves, look for different methods, produce methods. Facts are not the whole truth, they are only raw material, out of which one must extract and forge the genuine truth of art."<sup>43, 44</sup>

<sup>40</sup> Talk with Turkish writers and journalists, in *Pravda*, 6 May, 1932, No 124.

<sup>41</sup> "Talks on Craftsmanship," *O Literature*, p. 356.

<sup>42</sup> "Talk with Young Writers," p. 323.

<sup>43</sup> "About Plays," *ibid*, p. 151

<sup>44</sup> It should be noted that even during the period of his "critical Realism" Gorky demanded a differentiation between factual and artistic truth. Thus, in a letter to I. Surguchev, one of the many authors whom he helped to become known and successful, he wrote, on 10 January, 1912:

"I fear that your experience with the actual Governor may be reflected in the Governor of your novel; that the niggardly and monstrous *truth of the present moment of our life* may infringe the high truth of art, whose life is longer than our personal life, and whose truth is more important than the miserable truth of our today. . . [Referring to the local evil lamented by Surguchev]: But that is just a skin disease, due to our cachexia and to the filthy conditions in which we live—rest assured that we shall be cured of that!"

—*M. Gorky. Materialy k issledovaniyu*, v. I, pp. 308–09.

He further advocates the need of exaggeration. Our writers "fail to understand that *genuine art has the right to exaggerate*, that Hercules, Prometheus, Don Quixote, Faust are . . . quite legitimate and necessary poetic exaggerations of actual facts. Our actual, living hero, the man engaged in creating a socialist culture, is far higher and bigger than the heroes of our stories and novels. In literature one should depict him even bigger and brighter than he is; this is demanded not only by life but also by Socialist Realism, whose duty is to reason hypothetically, and hypothesis is the blood sister of hyperbole."<sup>45</sup>

Such exaggeration means vision, perspective. To attain that, one must rise above the immediate. Gorky quotes the saying "The higher you stand, the more you will see."<sup>46</sup> Again and again he calls on the writer to sharpen and deepen his power of observation. "In order to shed full and clear light on the poisonous abominations of the past, you must cultivate the ability to look upon it from the height of our present achievements, and from the height of the lofty aims of our future. This elevated point of view should, and will, arouse that proud, joyous pathos which will lend our literature a new tone, will help it to create new forms, will create the school we need—Socialist Realism."<sup>47</sup>

In this school Gorky hoped to find the synthesis of Realism and Romanticism, for which he had been groping all his life. His dreams and yearnings, his persevering faith in the intelligence and beauty of organised collective will, found expression in this literary echo of Soviet reality. In his own words:

Socialist Realism affirms life as action, as creative effort whose aim is the incessant development of man's most precious individual faculties, for the sake of his triumph over the forces of nature, for the sake of his health and longevity, for the sake of the great happiness of living on this earth which, according to the growth of his needs, he is determined to cultivate fully as a beautiful abode of humanity united into one family.<sup>48</sup>

*University of California.*

ALEXANDER KAUN.

<sup>45</sup> "Concerning a Certain Polemic," *ibid.*, p. 109.

<sup>46</sup> "Literary Diversions," II, *ibid.*, p. 363.

<sup>47</sup> "Talk with Young Writers," p. 320.

<sup>48</sup> "About Socialist Realism," *ibid.*, p. 350.

## CURRENT RUSSIAN LITERATURE

### VII. BORIS ZAYTSEV

THERE are many things which contribute to the uniqueness of the present-day Russian emigration and make it unlike any other earlier political emigration. One of these things is the literature it possesses. It is true that the French emigration had its de Maistre and its Chateaubriand, and the Poles their Mickiewicz, but neither of those emigrations had such a vast and varied literature and such a developed literary life as has the Russian emigration of our days, when there is hardly a country, hardly a large centre in any of the continents where the Russian printed word, in some form or other, does not appear. In the very first years of the emigration, namely in 1921, when Soviet Russia was enjoying the first fruits of the Nep in the form of comparative cultural and economic freedom, it was possible for one of the independent literary reviews published there to discuss dispassionately and objectively the eventual contribution of the emigration to general Russian literature. But the author of that article could not foresee, of course, the extent to which Russian émigré literature would develop. It was then in its infancy and was represented exclusively by well-known writers of the older generation, such as Merezhkovsky, Bunin, Kuprin, Hippins and others, who had left Russia after the civil war was over and were to be joined later by several of their contemporaries (Shmelyov, Remizov, Zaytsev). But not many people in the emigration itself expected at the time that the émigré literature would be able to produce its own younger generation. Since the article in question was written, the literary output of the emigration has grown enormously, and its literary life, despite all the adverse circumstances, has greatly developed. The sixty odd volumes of its principal periodical—*Sovremennyya Zapiski* (*Contemporary Annals*)—are in themselves a worthy memorial to the cultural activities of the emigration, the variety of its interests and the broadness of its outlook. Although at present an article like the one mentioned above would be quite unthinkable in any inside-Russian publication, where references to the émigré literature are nowadays very rare and then always disparaging, no future impartial historian of post-revolutionary Russian literature will be able to overlook the output of its émigré section.

Among the pre-revolutionary Russian writers now active outside Russia, a distinguished place belongs to Boris Konstantinovich Zaytsev (b. 1881) who recently published the first instalment of what looks likely to become his *magnum opus*—the first volume of his *Gleb's Journey*. Zaytsev, who is little known in this country, joined the emigration in 1922 when, with a group of well-known writers, philosophers, economists and journalists whose views did not fit in with official ideology, he was deported from Russia. He lived at first in Berlin, but after a short stay in Italy, where he used to live for long periods before the Revolution, he came to Paris and settled there as did the majority of Russian writers.

Zaytsev began his literary activities in the early years of the present century, soon after Chekhov's death, and belonged to the Chekhov tradition of short story, which went back to Turgenev and was continued and cultivated by Bunin and some other writers of the so-called "Realist" school of this period. Within this tradition Zaytsev represented the most pronounced subjective, lyrical tendency, with a strong leaning towards mysticism. His art was an art of undertones, of mellow, subdued lyricism. Lyrical short stories, almost devoid of "story" in the strict sense of the word, of plot, relying for their effect on a subjective evocation of atmosphere, and essentially poetical in their verbal structure—which at times gave them an air of artificiality and affectation—seemed to be Zaytsev's proper medium. When he tackled a novel (*Dalny Kray—Distant Land*) in which he tried to portray objectively the Russian youth during the period of the 1905 Revolution, it was on the whole a failure: Zaytsev seemed to lack the makings of an objective novelist capable of recreating a world lying wholly outside himself. Even Zaytsev's longest stories (for instance *The Blue Star*, one of his best) are essentially poetical.

Zaytsev's post-revolutionary output comprises a book of Italian sketches (*Italy*) written in his usual lyrical manner, a book of novellas and little dramas (*Rafael*) two books of short stories (*Ulitsa Sv. Nikolaya*, and *Strannoe Puteshestvie*), four novels (*Zolotoy Uzor*, *Anna*, *Dom v Passy* and *Puteshestvie Gleba*), a Life of Turgenev, a Life of St. Sergius of Radonezh, and two books of travels describing his visits to Mount Athos and to the famous Russian monastery on the island of Valaam, now in Finland.

In some of Zaytsev's later stories the outline is clearer, the touch firmer, the lyricism not so all-absorbing. Some of them, as for instance, the title-story in *The Strange Trip* and *Avdotyia-Smert* in the same collection, deal with Russian life under revolutionary



conditions which Zaytsev was able to observe at close quarters for five years; others have for their subject émigré life (one of the best, showing Zaytsev also capable of objective characterisation, is *Nikolay Kaliforniysky* in the same volume—a portrait of a queer Russian character somewhat in the Leskov tradition); still others (all the novellas in *Rafael*, for instance, or *Alexey Bozhy Chelovek* in *Strannoe Puteshestvie*) are written round non-Russian subjects. "Alexis the man of God" is once more reminiscent of Leskov, namely, of his stories drawn from the ancient *Prologue*, and is the life-story of one of the great Saints of the Christian Church. It is written in a simple, transparent prose, free from the poetical emphasis in which Zaytsev sometimes indulges. It is also expressive of the deep religious, Christian strain which pervades most of Zaytsev's post-revolutionary work. His deep attachment to the Orthodox Church, born apparently of his experience in exile, is also manifest in his visits to Mount Athos and Valaam and his books about them, as well as in his little booklet about St. Sergius of Radonezh.

Of Zaytsev's four "novels" two are hardly such (*Anna* and *Gleb's Journey*). Of the other two the first in time was *Zolotoy Uzor* (*The Golden Pattern*), published in book form in 1926 (there is a French translation of it published by Hachette under the title *La Guirlande dorée*). Of all the four it fits in most with the conventional idea of a novel. Its scene is laid partly in Russia before and after the Revolution, partly in Paris, partly in Italy which Zaytsev knows well. Its characters are drawn from a milieu also familiar to the author, that of the literary and artistic intelligentsia and the cultured country gentry. The novel is built round the life story and love affairs of the heroine, a singer in whose name the story is told. Although not without recourse to Zaytsev's usual apparatus of poetical effects—the Italian atmosphere is very well rendered—it shows a maturing and strengthening of his power of characterisation, if not of story-telling. Zaytsev's delicate and graceful manner lends itself well to a feminine autobiography.

*Anna*, published in 1929,<sup>1</sup> is a *nouvelle* rather than a novel. But within its 120 pages is condensed a poignant drama of love and jealousy drawn against the wider drama of the Revolution, taken not in its historical significance but in its everyday manifestations in the depth of the country. Zaytsev's writing becomes here unusually intense and packed, economical almost to bareness,

<sup>1</sup> Excellently translated into English by Mrs. Natalie Duddington, it was the first of Zaytsev's works to appear in this country. (George Allen & Unwin, 1937.)

but with every sentence, every word charged with potential force and meaning. There are usual poetical evocations of the landscape, but they are few and are done very effectively, so that they fit in with the story itself. Here is one of them, for instance :

Through the small windows came the fading light of a Russian autumn day when there is no sunset glow over the horizon, the clouds are a uniform grey, a derelict stack of vetch shows brown in the fields, the wind worries the potato tops, and a solitary colt, thin and long-legged, stands phantom-like in the distance—and suddenly with a shrill neigh spreads out its tail and rushes home like a whirlwind.

There is no detailed characterisation, no superfluous psychological analysis; the method used is that of suggestion, but the characters stand out clear and sharply individualised, beginning with the heroine, a somewhat mysterious, strong, silent and passionate girl who lives—as a poor relation and a servant all in one—on the farm of her adoptive uncle Matvey Martynych, a Lettish pig-breeder in Central Russia, a sly, practical, matter-of-fact man who tries to make the best of his situation under the revolutionary régime, cajoling and coaxing the new representatives of authority. Clumsy and inarticulate, he is a little sentimental and even romantic, and is attracted by Anna's passionately restrained femininity. His wife, Marta, is jealous of Anna; and in the end this jealousy of Marta, who is deliberately kept in the shadow, brings on the tragic end of Anna. Anna, however, is in love with Arkady Ivanych, a former landowner, a typical carefree *barin*, a ladies' man, who is ruined economically by the Revolution and physically, to the point of dying, by the effects of drinking and a fast life. Anna takes him in hand and, leaving one day her uncle's pig-farm, comes to look after Arkady until he dies. Next to these principal characters there are some excellently drawn episodic figures of the chairman and secretary of the village Soviet, of the happy-go-lucky family of the Nemeshayevs, the local squires, of the country woman doctor, Marya Mikhaylovna. One of the powerfully written episodic scenes is the description of the slaughtering of the pigs by Anna and her uncle with a view to avoid their requisition by the Soviets. Some time after the tragic end of Anna, which he could not prevent and which his wife even helped to bring about, Matvey Martynych decides to leave the country and go back to his native Latvia. He takes leave of the Nemeshayevs and through a conversation with Lenochka is reminded of Anna and made aware of the tragic changes around him. Only his son, the little Martyn, was still the same: "He was still playing with his toys, creating and destroying what he had made,

and it made no difference to him whether he played at Martynovka or in Moscow or in the far-off Latvia. Life was all he knew as yet." On this characteristic note the book, one of Zaytsev's best, ends.

Zaytsev's next novel, *The House in Passy* (1935), has for its subject the life of the average Russian émigrés in Paris, their sufferings and joys, seen through the author's lyrical, misty, and somewhat sentimentalising, glasses. The characters are many and varied—an old general, an accoucheuse, a little boy, and several others. They are hardly rounded off, merely evoked. The novel, as a whole, suffers from a certain looseness of construction. The general mood which pervades it is that of resignation.

Zaytsev's latest work (1937)—*Gleb's Journey* (of which only the first volume has so far appeared in book form with the sub-title *The Dawn*)—is not described by the author as a novel. Nor is it, however, an autobiography pure and simple, though its autobiographical inspiration seems beyond doubt. Its literary nature is therefore difficult to define. In its general conception it has something in common with Bunin's *Life of Arsenyev* (translated into English as *The Well of Days*), but in execution it differs. Unlike Bunin's book which reads like a novelised autobiography, not necessarily "accurate" as to facts, but essentially true to the spiritual pattern of life, Zaytsev's new work is not written in the first person and thus has a semblance of objectivity. This semblance is carried still further in that, unlike the unified subjective view of the world of Bunin's narrator, who coincides with the author, Zaytsev presents his world through the multiple perception of his little hero, the boy Gleb (the choice of the name if anything is a cleverly concealed hint that it is autobiographical, because Boris and Gleb were two brother martyrs, Russian princes, who are commemorated on the same day), of some of the other characters surrounding Gleb in his childhood, and of the author himself. This multiplicity of perception becomes especially apparent in the last pages of the book describing the visit of the provincial governor to the house of Gleb's parents, the hunt when little Gleb wounds an elk and the memorial service for Gleb's Polish grandmother, where we are given Gleb's childish view of those events, the Governor's feelings during his visit (here, there is a rare touch of Tolstoy in Zaytsev's manner), and of Gleb's father during the hunt and at the memorial service, and in the last lines of the book the author's own projection of it all into the future and anticipation of it when he says:

No one knew anything about his or her own fate. Gleb did not know that he was seeing Lyudinovo for the last time. His father did not know that in a few years he would be in a quite different part of Russia. His mother did not know that she would survive her husband and see the crumbling of all their former life. And the she-elk, who on that fatal day for her came with her little one across a little armed boy, did not know that she was for the last time passing through that aspen copse.

The Governor with side-whiskers had happily completed his tour. Everywhere there were police chiefs and constables. Everywhere people bowed before him and received him as in Lyudinovo. He sincerely believed that he had brought everywhere order and welfare. Feeling somewhat fatigued by the journey, he did not think, however, of what was to come and could not imagine that thirty years hence he would be carried, sick, half-paralysed, out of his family house in the province of Ryazan and shot on the lawn in the park.

This multiplicity of perception gives the author more freedom in his narrative, saves him the necessity either of reading an adult meaning into childish perceptions (which is sometimes inevitable in Bunin's case) or of remaining all the time true to childish psychology. It also gives an outlet for his lyrical subjectivism, for occasional philosophising.

The title of the book is symbolical. It is a story of Gleb's (or the author's?) journey through life. The narrative moves slowly; the first volume covers only a few years in Gleb's life, from the time he can remember himself to his first year at school (another difference from Bunin's "autobiographical" work which is more condensed, more synthetical). There are evocations of Central Russia and its landscape, the scene being laid on the banks of the Zhizdra in the parts immortalised by Turgenev and situated not very far from Tolstoy's Yasnaya Polyana; of provincial life in the town of Kaluga; of the interests of the Russian youth of the period. But the main interest is focussed on Gleb himself, a shy introspective boy, on his gradually growing and developing contacts with life and with the human beings surrounding him: his mother, his father, his elder sister Liza, his cousin Sonya, his governess, his father's colleagues and fellow-sportsmen, his teachers in Kaluga, the outstanding characters of the village of Usty. We see all these characters both as Gleb sees them and as the author presents them. Sometimes Gleb's point of view prevails, comes to the fore, and thus one of the main episodes of the book—the appearance in the family of the somewhat mysterious young governess, Sofya Eduardovna,

and the discord which she brings in her trail—we see almost entirely through Gleb's half-understanding eyes. This helps the author to keep to his subdued, "veiled" manner. Any emphasis, any passionateness, is alien to Zaytsev's nature. It is not for nothing that his art has often been compared to that of a water-colour or pastel artist. There is about it invariably a touch of delicacy and lightness. Though without any tendency to idealisation, *Gleb's Journey* is a light and delicate pastel picture of the Russia gone forever. Essentially a retrospective book, almost bared, besides, of the elements of fiction, it is perhaps significant and characteristic of the prevailing tendency among the older émigré writers, which is not, however, maintained by their successors.

GLEB STRUVE.

# SOVIET LEGISLATION

## Act on the organisation of Legal Procedure in the USSR Union and Autonomous Republics.

### I

#### GENERAL ORDINANCES

ARTICLE 1. In conformity with Art. 102 of the Constitution of the USSR, justice within the USSR is administered by the Supreme Court of the USSR, the Supreme Courts of the Union Republics, the regional and territorial courts of the Autonomous Republics and Autonomous Regions, district courts, special courts of the USSR set up by order of the Supreme Council of the USSR, and people's courts.

ARTICLE 2. Justice within the USSR aims at defending against all attack :

(a) the public and State order of the USSR, as established by the Constitution of the USSR, the socialist economic system and socialist property ;

(b) political, labour, domiciliary and other individual and proprietary rights and interests of the citizens of the USSR, as guaranteed by the Constitution of the USSR and the constitutions of the Union and Autonomous Republics ;

(c) rights and interests of State institutions, concerns, collective farms, co-operatives and other public organisations protected by law.

Justice within the USSR aims at guaranteeing the exact and undeviating execution of Soviet laws on the part of all institutions, organisations, officials and citizens of the USSR.

ARTICLE 3. The Soviet Tribunal, applying measures for the punishment of crime, does not merely chastise criminals, but also aims at reforming and re-educating them.

Throughout its entire activities the Tribunal educates the citizens of the USSR in the spirit of loyalty to the fatherland and the cause of socialism, in the spirit of an exact and undeviating execution of Soviet laws, care for socialist property, labour discipline, an honourable attitude towards State and public duties, and respect for the rules of a socialist community.

ARTICLE 4. The tasks enumerated in Art. 2 of the present Act are performed by the courts as follows :

(a) the hearing in court of criminal offences and the application of legally established punitive measures to traitors to the fatherland, wreckers, embezzlers of socialist property and other enemies of the people, and also to robbers, thieves, hooligans and other criminals ;

(b) the hearing and settlement in court of cases concerning disputes affecting the rights and interests of citizens, State institutions, concerns, collective farms and other public organisations.

ARTICLE 5. Justice within the USSR is administered on the basis of

(a) a tribunal, one and equal for all citizens, irrespective of the social, proprietary and official status of the citizens and their national and racial standing;

(b) a unified code of criminal and civil law and court procedure of the USSR compulsory for all courts.

ARTICLE 6. The courts are independent and subordinated solely to the law (Art. 112 of the Constitution of the USSR).

ARTICLE 7. In conformity with Art. 110 of the Constitution of the USSR, procedure in court is conducted in the language of the Union or Autonomous Republic or Autonomous Region, with the guarantee to persons ignorant of that language of every facility for becoming acquainted with the material of the case through an interpreter, and of the right to speak in court in their native language.

ARTICLE 8. In conformity with Art. 111 of the Constitution, the hearing of all cases in all courts of the USSR is to be public, so far as exceptions are not stipulated by law, and with a guarantee to the accused of the right to employ counsel

ARTICLE 9. In conformity with Art. 103 of the Constitution of the USSR, the hearing of cases in all courts of the USSR is carried out with the participation of people's assessors, except in cases specially stipulated by law.

ARTICLE 10. In conformity with Articles 105, 106, 107, 108 and 109 of the Constitution of the USSR, the courts in the USSR are formed on the basis of election, the procedure for which is laid down in the present Act.

ARTICLE 11. All citizens enjoying the right to vote may become judges and people's assessors.

ARTICLE 12. The people's assessors are called upon to perform their functions in court in rotation according to a register, for a period of not more than 10 days a year, except when prolongation is necessitated by the circumstances of the case under examination.

During the exercise of their functions in court the people's assessors enjoy all the rights of judges.

ARTICLE 13. People's assessors from among workers and employees retain their wages during the period of attendance in court.

In all other cases the expenses incurred by the people's assessors in the exercise of their functions in court are met by a special order established by the legislation of the Union Republics.

ARTICLE 14. The hearing of cases is conducted in all courts before one judge and two people's assessors, except for cases particularly specified by law, the hearing of which is conducted before three members of the court.

ARTICLE 15. The verdicts, decisions and resolutions of all courts, except those of the Supreme Court of the USSR and the Supreme Courts of the Union Republics, may be appealed against to a higher court in the legally established manner, by the accused, their counsel, the claimants, defendants and representatives of their interests, or by the prosecutor.

The higher court, examining the protests and appeals on the basis of the materials of the case submitted to it, verifies the legality and justice of the verdict or resolution pronounced by the lower court.

ARTICLE 16. The verdicts, decisions and resolutions of the court which have legally entered into force may be protested against only by the Prosecutor of the USSR or the Prosecutor of a Union Republic, the President of the Supreme Court of the USSR and the President of the Supreme Court of a Union Republic, in conformity with Articles 57, 64 and 74 of the present Act.

ARTICLE 17. Judges may be released from their office and people's assessors from their duties only if recalled by their electors, or on the strength of a court verdict against them.

ARTICLE 18. The filing of a criminal prosecution against judges, their consequent removal from office and committal for trial are enacted

(a) in respect of people's judges, members of regional, territorial and district courts and the courts of Autonomous Regions, members of the Supreme Courts of Union and Autonomous Republics, by order of the Prosecutor of a Union Republic, with the sanction of the Presidium of the Supreme Council of the Union Republic;

(b) in respect of members of the Supreme Court of the USSR and members of special courts of the USSR, by order of the Prosecutor of the USSR, with the sanction of the Presidium of the Supreme Council of the USSR.

ARTICLE 19. In the event of the temporary absence of a people's judge (illness, leave, etc.), his duties during his absence are devolved by the district council of workers' deputies on one of the people's assessors.

ARTICLE 20. In the event of a people's judge leaving before the expiration of his term of office, the election of a new people's judge is organised not later than within 2 months from the day of his departure from office.

The election of a new people's judge is organised by the People's Commissariat of Justice of the Union Republic, and in an Autonomous Republic by the People's Commissariat of Justice of the Autonomous Republic.

In the event of the departure from office of members of district, territorial, regional and Supreme Courts of Union and Autonomous Republics, and likewise of members of special courts and the Supreme Court of the USSR, the election of new members of courts takes place



during an ordinary session of the councils of worker's deputies of the region, territory or district, and the Supreme Council of a Union or Autonomous Republic and the Supreme Council of the USSR.

## II

### THE PEOPLE'S COURT

ARTICLE 21. The People's Court deals with .

(a) criminal cases, concerned with crimes against the life, health, liberty and dignity of the citizen—murders, the inflicting of bodily injuries, the performance of illegal abortions, the illegal deprivation of liberty, the ill-intentioned non-payment of alimonies, insult, hooliganism, calumny, crimes against property—banditry, robbery, theft, swindling, extortion, crimes of office by official persons—abuse of power, excess of power, inaction, embezzlement, inefficiency, forgery, incorrect weighing and measuring, inflation of prices, crimes against the system of government—violation of the electoral law, wilful non-payment of legally established rates and taxes, refusal to fulfil State deliveries and corvées, evasion of conscription and of the duties of military service, violation of the lawful orders of the State authorities;

(b) civil cases—property claims, claims in connection with the Labour Code, claims for payment of alimony, claims for inheritance and other criminal and civil cases subject to settlement by law

ARTICLE 22. In conformity with Article 109 of the Constitution of the USSR, the People's Courts are elected by the citizens of the district on the basis of universal, direct and equal suffrage, by secret vote, for a term of three years.

ARTICLE 23. The people's judges and people's assessors are elected by the citizens of the district in electoral wards, an electoral ward for the election of people's judges and people's assessors comprising the entire population resident within the area wherein the said People's Court functions.

ARTICLE 24. The right to nominate candidates for the office of people's judges and people's assessors is reserved to public organisations and associations of workers: the Communist Party organisations, trade unions, co-operatives, Youth organisations, cultural societies, and likewise to general meetings of workers and employees in their concerns, to the armed forces in their units, to general meetings of peasants in their collective farms, to workers and employees of state farms in their farms.

ARTICLE 25. The method of registration of candidates, and of the publication of the lists of candidates for the posts of people's judges and people's assessors, as well as the date of and procedure at elections, are determined by the " Ordinances for the Election of Judges and People's Assessors," ratified by the Supreme Councils of the Union Republics.

ARTICLE 26. The number of People's Courts for each district is fixed by the Council of People's Commissars of the Union Republic on the recommendation of the People's Commissar of Justice of the Union Republic

In the Autonomous Republics the number of People's Courts in each district is determined by the Council of People's Commissars of the Autonomous Republic.

ARTICLE 27. Prior to the hearing of a case in court, the People's Court .

(a) ratifies the act of indictment presented by the prosecutor. In the event of disagreement with the act of indictment, the People's Court has the right either to return it to the prosecutor for re-examination, or, if such action is well-founded, to close the case ,

(b) decides the question of placing the accused in custody or liberating him ,

(c) pronounces the decision concerning the obligatory participation of counsel and prosecutor in the hearing of the case

ARTICLE 28. The people's judge :

(a) on the strength of appeals and statements received, pronounces the decision to commence criminal prosecution, or refuses to do so ;

(b) if necessary, sends statements and appeals to the investigating organs for examination ;

(c) appoints cases for hearing ;

(d) issues orders for the summoning to court of the accused, witnesses and experts, and informs the claimants and defendants of the date appointed for the hearing of the case ;

(e) presides at the sitting of the People's Court.

ARTICLE 29. The people's judges report to their electors on their work and the functioning of the People's Court.

### III

#### TERRITORIAL, REGIONAL AND DISTRICT COURTS AND THE COURTS OF AUTONOMOUS REGIONS

ARTICLE 30. In conformity with Art. 108 of the Constitution of the USSR, the Territorial, Regional and District Courts and the Courts of Autonomous Regions are elected by the territorial, regional and district councils of workers' deputies or the council of workers' deputies of an Autonomous Region for a term of five years.

ARTICLE 31. The Territorial, Regional and District Courts and the Courts of Autonomous Regions consist of a president, deputy presidents, members of the court and people's assessors, summoned to take part in the hearing of cases.

ARTICLE 32. The Territorial, Regional and District Courts and the Courts of Autonomous Regions deal with criminal cases legally placed

under their jurisdiction, counter-revolutionary crimes, particularly dangerous crimes against the government of the State, theft of socialist property, specially grave official and economic crimes; and likewise with civil cases legally placed under their jurisdiction, disputes between State and public institutions, concerns and organisations.

The Territorial, Regional and District Courts and the Courts of Autonomous Regions also examine appeals and protests against the verdicts, decisions and resolutions of the People's Courts.

ARTICLE 33 The Territorial, Regional and District Courts and the Courts of Autonomous Regions function through the following bodies

(a) a judicial collegium for criminal cases, which examines criminal cases under the jurisdiction of the Territorial, Regional and District Courts and the Courts of Autonomous Regions, and likewise examines appeals and protests against the verdicts and resolutions of the People's Courts;

(b) a judicial collegium for civil cases, which examines civil cases under the jurisdiction of the Territorial, Regional and District Courts and the Courts of Autonomous Regions, and likewise examines appeals and protests against the decisions and resolutions of the People's Courts.

ARTICLE 34. The judicial collegia of the Territorial, Regional and District Courts and of the Courts of Autonomous Regions, when examining criminal and civil cases, are composed of a chairman (the president or a member of the court) and two people's assessors.

ARTICLE 35. The judicial collegia of the Territorial, Regional and District Courts and of the Courts of Autonomous Regions, when examining appeals and protests against the verdicts, decisions and resolutions of the People's Courts, are composed of three members of the corresponding court.

ARTICLE 36. In regions forming part of a Territory, the composition of the district and regional courts is the same as that of the Territorial Court.

ARTICLE 37. The President of a Territorial, Regional or District Court or of the Court of an Autonomous Region presides at the court sittings or appoints to preside a member of the Territorial, Regional or District Court or the Court of an Autonomous Region, appoints cases for hearing, issues orders for the summoning to court of the accused, witnesses and experts, and informs the claimants and defendants of the date appointed for the hearing of the case.

#### IV

#### THE SUPREME COURT OF AN AUTONOMOUS REPUBLIC

ARTICLE 38. In conformity with Art. 107 of the Constitution of the USSR, the Supreme Court of an Autonomous Republic is elected by the Supreme Council of the Autonomous Republic for a term of five years.

ARTICLE 39 The Supreme Court of an Autonomous Republic is composed of the president, deputy presidents, members of the court and people's assessors, summoned to participate in the hearing of judicial cases.

ARTICLE 40. The Supreme Court of an Autonomous Republic deals with criminal cases placed under its jurisdiction by the law, counter-revolutionary crimes, particularly dangerous crimes against the government of the State, theft of socialist property, specially grave official and economic crimes, and likewise with civil cases legally placed under its jurisdiction, disputes between State and public institutions, concerns and organisations.

The Supreme Court of an Autonomous Republic also examines appeals and protests against the verdicts, decisions and resolutions of the People's Courts.

ARTICLE 41. The Supreme Court of an Autonomous Republic functions through the following bodies .

(a) a judicial collegium for criminal cases, which examines criminal cases placed by the law under the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court of an Autonomous Republic, and likewise examines the appeals and protests against the verdicts and resolutions of the People's Courts;

(b) a judicial collegium for civil cases, which examines civil cases placed by law under the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court of an Autonomous Republic, and likewise examines appeals and protests against the decisions and resolutions of the People's Courts.

ARTICLE 42 The judicial collegia of the Supreme Court of an Autonomous Republic, when examining cases, are composed of a chairman (the president or a member of the Supreme Court) and two people's assessors.

ARTICLE 43. The judicial collegia of the Supreme Court of an Autonomous Republic, when examining appeals and protests against the verdicts, decisions and resolutions of the People's Courts, are composed of three members of the Supreme Court of the Autonomous Republic.

ARTICLE 44. The President of the Supreme Court of an Autonomous Republic presides at the sittings of the Court or appoints for this purpose a member of the Supreme Court of the Autonomous Republic, appoints cases for hearing, orders the summoning before the court of the accused, witnesses and experts, and informs the claimants and defendants of the date appointed for the hearing of the case.

## V

### THE SUPREME COURT OF A UNION REPUBLIC

ARTICLE 45. The Supreme Court of a Union Republic is the highest judicial organ of a Union Republic. The Supreme Court of a Union

Republic is endowed with the power of control over the judicial activities of all the judicial organs of the Union Republic, Autonomous Republics, territories, regions and districts included in the Union Republic.

ARTICLE 46 In conformity with Art 106 of the Constitution of the USSR, the Supreme Court of a Union Republic is elected by the Supreme Council of the Union Republic for a term of five years.

ARTICLE 47 The Supreme Court of a Union Republic is composed of a president, deputy presidents, members of the court and people's assessors, summoned to take part in the hearing of cases

ARTICLE 48. The Supreme Court of a Union Republic functions through the following bodies

(a) a judicial collegium for criminal cases, which examines criminal cases placed by law under the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court of the Union Republic, and likewise examines appeals and protests against the verdicts and resolutions of the territorial, regional and other courts of the Union Republic;

(b) judicial collegia for civil cases, which examine civil cases legally placed under the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court of the Union Republic, and likewise examine appeals and protests against the decisions and resolutions of the territorial, regional and other courts of the Union Republic.

ARTICLE 49. The judicial collegia of the Supreme Court of a Union Republic, when examining cases, are composed of a chairman (the president or member of the Supreme Court) and two people's assessors

ARTICLE 50. The judicial collegia of the Supreme Court of a Union Republic, when examining the appeals and protests against the verdicts, decisions and resolutions of the territorial, regional and other courts of a Union Republic, are composed of three members of the Supreme Court.

ARTICLE 51. The Supreme Court of a Union Republic exercises control over the judicial activities of the Courts of the Republic :

(a) by examining the protests of the Prosecutor of the USSR, the Prosecutor of the Union Republic, the President of the Supreme Court of the USSR or the President of the Supreme Court of the Union Republic against the verdicts, decisions and resolutions which have legally come into force;

(b) by examining in court appeals and protests on cases settled by the courts of the Union Republics.

ARTICLE 52. The President of the Supreme Court of a Union Republic presides in court or appoints to preside in court a member of the Supreme Court of the Union Republic, appoints cases for hearing, orders the summoning to court of the accused, witnesses and experts, and informs the claimants and defendants of the date fixed for the hearing of the case.

## VI

## THE SPECIAL COURTS OF THE USSR

ARTICLE 53. In conformity with Art. 102 of the Constitution of the USSR the following special courts also function :

- (a) Military Tribunals;
- (b) Railway-Transport Courts;
- (c) Water-Transport Courts.

ARTICLE 54 In conformity with Art. 105 of the Constitution of the USSR, the president, deputy presidents and members of the special courts of the USSR are elected by the Supreme Council of the USSR for a term of five years.

ARTICLE 55. People's assessors, elected by the territorial and regional councils of workers' deputies and the Supreme Councils of the Union and Autonomous Republics, are called in to take part in the sittings of the Military Tribunals and the Railway and Water-Transport Courts.

ARTICLE 56. The Military Tribunals and the Railway and Water-Transport Courts, when hearing cases, are composed of a chairman (the president or a member of the court) and two people's assessors, except in cases which by law are heard in the presence of three members of the corresponding court.

ARTICLE 57. The Military Tribunals are established :

- (a) in military districts, at army fronts, and in fleets;
- (b) in armies, corps, other army bodies and militarised institutions.

ARTICLE 58. The Military Tribunals deal with cases of crime in the armed forces and likewise with other crimes placed under their jurisdiction by law.

ARTICLE 59. The Military Tribunals in military districts, at army fronts and in fleets examine criminal cases placed under their jurisdiction by law, and likewise examine appeals and protests against verdicts on cases heard by the Military Tribunals of armies, corps, other army bodies and militarised institutions.

ARTICLE 60. The Courts for Railway and Water Transport examine cases placed under their jurisdiction by law, crimes aiming at the undermining of labour discipline in the transport services and other crimes which obstruct the normal functioning of the transport services.

ARTICLE 61. The Courts for Railway and Water Transport are established on the railways and waterways respectively.

ARTICLE 62. The presidents of the Military Tribunals and of the Courts for Railway and Water Transport preside at the judicial sittings of the courts or appoint as chairmen at the judicial sittings members of the Military Tribunals and Courts for Railway and Water

Transport, appoint cases for hearing, order the summoning before the court of the accused, witnesses and experts.

## VII

## THE SUPREME COURT OF THE USSR

ARTICLE 63. In conformity with Articles 104 and 105 of the Constitution of the USSR, the Supreme Court of the USSR is the highest judicial organ, and is elected by the Supreme Council of the USSR for a term of five years.

The Supreme Court of the USSR is empowered to exercise control over the judicial activities of all the judicial organs of the USSR and the Union Republics.

ARTICLE 64. The Supreme Court of the USSR exercises control over the judicial activities of all the judicial organs of the USSR and the Union Republics :

(a) by examining the protests of the Prosecutor of the USSR and the President of the Supreme Court of the USSR against the verdicts, decisions and resolutions of the courts which have come into legal force,

(b) by examining the appeals and protests against cases heard by Military Tribunals and Courts for Railway and Water Transport.

ARTICLE 65. The Supreme Court of the USSR is composed of a President, deputy presidents, members of the Supreme Court and people's assessors, summoned to participate in the hearing of judicial cases, and acts through the following bodies :

(a) a judicial collegium for criminal cases,

(b) a judicial collegium for civil cases;

(c) a military collegium;

(d) a railway collegium;

(e) a water-transport collegium.

ARTICLE 66. The judicial collegium for criminal cases of the Supreme Court of the USSR examines criminal cases placed under its jurisdiction by law, and likewise examines protests against the verdicts and resolutions of the Supreme Courts of the Union Republics.

ARTICLE 67. The judicial collegium for civil cases of the Supreme Court of the USSR examines civil cases placed under its jurisdiction by law, and likewise examines protests against the decisions and resolutions of the Supreme Courts of the Union Republics.

ARTICLE 68. The judicial collegia for criminal and civil cases of the Supreme Court of the USSR, when examining cases, are composed of a chairman (the president or a member of the Supreme Court of the USSR) and two people's assessors.

The judicial collegia for criminal and civil cases of the Supreme Court of the USSR, when examining protests against the verdicts, decisions and

resolutions of the Supreme Courts of the Union Republics, are composed of three members of the Supreme Court of the USSR.

ARTICLE 69. The military collegium of the Supreme Court of the USSR examines cases placed under its jurisdiction by law, and likewise examines protests and appeals against the verdicts and resolutions of the Military Tribunals.

ARTICLE 70. The military collegium of the Supreme Court of the USSR, when examining cases, is composed of a chairman (the president or a member of the military collegium of the Supreme Court of the USSR) and two people's assessors, except in cases specially stipulated by the code of criminal procedure, when cases are examined by three members of the military collegium.

The military collegium of the Supreme Court of the USSR, when examining protests and appeals against the verdicts and resolutions of the military tribunals, is composed of three members of the military collegium of the Supreme Court of the USSR.

ARTICLE 71. The railway and water-transport collegia of the Supreme Court of the USSR examine cases of crime placed under their jurisdiction by law, and likewise examine protests and appeals against the verdicts and resolutions of the Courts for Railway and Water Transport.

ARTICLE 72. The railway and water-transport collegia of the Supreme Court of the USSR, when examining cases, are composed of a chairman (the president or member of the collegium in question) and two people's assessors.

ARTICLE 73. The railway and water-transport collegia of the Supreme Court of the USSR, when examining protests and appeals against the verdicts and resolutions of Courts for Railway and Water Transport, are composed of three members of the corresponding collegium of the Supreme Court of the USSR.

ARTICLE 74. The President of the Supreme Court of the USSR may personally assume the task of presiding at the hearing of any case submitted to a collegium of the Supreme Court of the USSR.

The President of the Supreme Court of the USSR and the Prosecutor of the USSR have the right to demand for examination any case from any court of the USSR or a Union Republic, and to lodge a protest thereon according to procedure established by law.

ARTICLE 75. For the examination of protests lodged by the President of the Supreme Court of the USSR or the Prosecutor of the USSR against the verdicts, decisions and resolutions of the collegia of the Supreme Court of the USSR, a Plenum of the Supreme Court of the USSR is summoned, which likewise issues directions on questions of judicial practice founded on the resolutions adopted by the Supreme Court of the USSR on cases examined previously.



ARTICLE 76. The Plenum of the Supreme Court of the USSR is composed of the President of the Supreme Court of the USSR, his deputies and all the members of the Supreme Court of the USSR.

The participation of the Prosecutor of the USSR in the sittings of the Plenum is obligatory

The People's Commissar of Justice of the USSR takes part in the sittings of the Plenum of the Supreme Court of the USSR

ARTICLE 77 The sittings of the Plenum of the Supreme Court of the USSR are summoned not less than once in two months

## VIII

### JUDICIAL EXECUTORS

ARTICLE 78 The execution of decisions and resolutions on civil cases, and of verdicts on criminal cases, in so far as they concern demands on property, is devolved upon judicial executors

ARTICLE 79. The judicial executors are attached to the People's Courts, the Territorial, Regional and District Courts, the Courts of the Autonomous Regions and the Supreme Courts of the Autonomous and Union Republics, and are appointed by the People's Commissariat of Justice of the Union Republic, and in the Autonomous Republics by the People's Commissariat of Justice of the Autonomous Republic.

ARTICLE 80. Orders for the execution of judicial sentences, decisions and resolutions presented by the judicial executors are obligatory for all officials and citizens.

President of the Presidium of the Supreme Council of the USSR.  
(Signed) M. KALININ.

Secretary of the Presidium of the Supreme Council of the USSR  
(Signed) A. GORKIN.

Moscow, the Kremlin,

16 August, 1938.

(*Izvestia*, 24 August, 1938, No. 198 (6865).)

### Act on Citizenship of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics

ARTICLE 1. On the basis of Article 21 of the Constitution (Basic Law) of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics a single Union citizenship is established for citizens of the USSR.

Every citizen of a Union Republic is a citizen of the USSR.

ARTICLE 2. The following are citizens of the USSR

- (a) All persons who on 7 November, 1917, were subjects of the former Russian Empire and have not forfeited Soviet citizenship;
- (b) persons who have legally acquired Soviet citizenship.

ARTICLE 3. Foreigners, irrespective of their nationality and race, are admitted to citizenship of the USSR upon petition to the Presidium of the Supreme Council of the USSR or the Presidium of the Supreme Council of a Union Republic within whose territory they are domiciled.

ARTICLE 4. Relinquishment of citizenship of the USSR is authorised by the Presidium of the Supreme Council of the USSR.

ARTICLE 5. The marriage of a male or female citizen of the USSR to a person not of USSR nationality does not entail a change of citizenship.

ARTICLE 6. In the event of a change of citizenship of parents, as a result of which both become citizens of the USSR or both relinquish USSR citizenship, a corresponding change of citizenship follows for their children below 14 years of age. In the case of children between the ages of 14 and 18, a change of citizenship may take place only with their consent.

In other cases change of citizenship for children below 18 years of age may only take place in accordance with general procedure.

ARTICLE 7. Persons may be deprived of USSR citizenship :

(a) by legal sentence, in cases stipulated by law ;

(b) by an individual order of the Presidium of the Supreme Council of the USSR.

ARTICLE 8. Persons domiciled upon the territory of the USSR who are not citizens of the USSR on the strength of the present Act, and who do not possess certificates of foreign nationality, are considered as stateless.

President of the Presidium of the Supreme Council of the USSR.  
(Signed) M. KALININ.

Secretary of the Presidium of the Supreme Council of the USSR.  
(Signed) A. GORKIN.

Moscow, the Kremlin,

19 August, 1938.

(*Izvestia*, 24 August, 1938, No. 198 (6665).)

### **Act on the Procedure of Ratification and Denunciation of the International Treatise of the USSR**

ARTICLE 1. In conformity with point *m* of Article 49 of the Constitution (Basic Law) of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the ratification of international treaties is performed by the Presidium of the Supreme Council of the USSR.

ARTICLE 2. Treaties subject to ratification are peace treaties, treaties of mutual assistance against aggression, treaties of mutual non-aggression.

International treaties, on the subsequent ratification of which the Contracting Parties had agreed at the time of their conclusion, are similarly subject to ratification.

ARTICLE 3. The denunciation of ratified international treaties takes place on the strength of orders of the Presidium of the Supreme Council of the USSR.

President of the Presidium of the Supreme Council of the USSR.  
(Signed) M. KALININ.

Secretary of the Presidium of the Supreme Council of the USSR.  
(Signed) A. GORKIN.

Moscow, the Kremlin,

20 August, 1938.

(*Izvestia*, 24 August, 1938. No 198 (6665))

## CHRONICLE

### UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

#### *The 21st Anniversary of the Soviet Republic*

On 7 November, the 21st anniversary of the "Bolshevik" Revolution was celebrated throughout the Soviet Union. As usual, the most important ceremonies took place in Moscow. The formal meeting in the Great Theatre, Moscow, was addressed by Molotov, Zhdanov and others. An impressive review of troops and marching workers passed before a tribune in the Red Square where the leaders of the Government took their places. A special feature of the parade was the participation of military aeroplanes. Aeroplanes participated also in the military reviews in other large centres—Voroshilov, Leningrad and Kiev. The general tenor of the speeches emphasised the peaceful intentions of the Soviet Union and its military preparedness to resist any aggression.

#### *History of the Communist (Bolshevik) Party*

A new history of the Communist Party was published in September. Appearing first as a serial in *Pravda*—9 September to 19 September—it next filled two complete issues of the fortnightly *Bolshevik* (15 September and 1 October), being published in book form (254 pages) only later. This History is presented (in *Bolshevik*) as a "powerful ideological weapon of Bolshevism" and its purpose is evidently a combination of catechism and propaganda. It is notable that, appearing during the Czechoslovak crisis, the History occupied whole pages of each issue of *Pravda* so that while during this period there were only two editorials about the Government attitude on the crisis, each day brought a large instalment of Party history culminating in the conclusion

that (1) capitalism means war, and (2) that imperialistic war must be turned into civil war.

*Russo-Japanese Friction in the Far East*

Beginning toward the end of July, a series of border incidents in the Far East, involving considerable fighting, disturbed the relations between the Soviet Union and Japan. They centred around disputed control of Changkufeng, a hill on the Korean-Siberian border near Lake Hasan, 130 kilometres south-west of Vladivostok. Border skirmishes developed into a situation approaching war, with large concentration of troops, tanks and artillery on both sides. Negotiations in Moscow between Litvinov and the Japanese ambassador Shigimitsu, after considerable difficulty augmented by new frontier incidents, arranged first a truce and then a temporary settlement of the difficulty. Negotiations were interrupted by a new outbreak of fighting, but an armistice was arranged for 11 August. A mixed commission to settle the dispute was finally agreed upon in Moscow by Litvinov and Shigimitsu. According to Soviet reports the settlement is based upon the acceptance of Soviet claims.

The Changkufeng incident has been variously explained. Since the Japanese seem to have been the aggressors, it is probable that they (a) wished to test Soviet military strength in the Far East, or (b) needed military activity against another Power to motivate and justify special measures needed to carry on the war in China.

*Soviet Russia and the "Czechoslovak Crisis"*

From the end of May, when the first Czechoslovak-German crisis was passed, the Soviet press gave considerable attention to the problems arising therefrom. It was explained that Russia's pact with Czechoslovakia required one party to aid the other in case of attack only on condition that France was already giving such assistance. The internal situation of Czechoslovakia, as well as German projects for expansion, were analysed in the Soviet press, and, as early as June, it was prophesied that France and England would urge a new orientation of Czechoslovak foreign policy involving friendly relations with Germany, and probably denunciation of the treaty with Russia.

At the first meeting of the League Assembly on 21 September, Litvinov formally affirmed Russia's intention to fulfil all the obligations involved in her pacts with France and Czechoslovakia. He concluded "Our War Department is ready at once to participate in a conference with representatives of the French and Czechoslovak Ministers of War, to discuss measures appropriate for the moment." Russia was said to have made definite arrangements for transporting troops across Roumania to Czechoslovakia. On 23 September an official warning was issued to Poland that if the latter should intrude upon Czechoslovak territory, the Soviet Union would denounce its non-aggression pact with Poland. *Izvestia* commented on Litvinov's speech with a strong article contrasting

the peace-loving, treaty-fulfilling policy of Soviet Russia with the attitude of England and France, closing, "You think you can content the aggressor by giving him what is not yours to dispose of. . . . We believe the aggressor understands only the language of force."

During the tense days at the end of September, although it devoted considerable space to the international situation, the Soviet press said practically nothing further as to the government's actions or intentions.

Once the crisis was passed, and the dismemberment of Czechoslovakia begun, the commentaries in Russia were not lacking in definiteness "The policy of Chamberlain is in substance a weakening of the League, an agreement with Fascist aggressors at the expense of small nations, and the realisation of the Four-Power Pact. The Munich agreement is the most monstrous of the treasonable acts yet committed by Chamberlain and the leading groups of English and French bourgeoisie"

*Izvestia* (24 October) summed up the Soviet Government's views in an article containing the following: "Chamberlain, incarnation of European reaction, set himself the task of paying the cost of the fascisation of Europe. . . . Through Hitler, Chamberlain was and is trying to smash the application of collective security . . . He wanted German fascism to murder European democracy in its sleep."

"The European reaction knew quite well that the victory of democracy over fascism, of peace-lovers over war-makers, is impossible without the participation of the USSR. . . . This is why Chamberlain was afraid of victory and retreated before fascist Germany. No well-informed politician could have any doubt of the Soviet Union's power and of the decisive force it could wield in argument with the war-makers. Germany knew that the USSR would fulfil its obligations in Europe. That the British and French leaders capitulated in spite of this, is not due to self-deception, but to their preference for surrender rather than victory."

An editorial in the *Journal de Moscou* continues the discussion of the consequences of the Munich agreement. The capitulation of France and England at Munich has resulted in a position where they are compelled to go on capitulating. We may soon hear of Lord Runciman's mission to Alsace and a report that Alsatians and French cannot live together, followed by Chamberlain's offer to save world peace by another "sacrifice." "Will the powers which still have their independence now make a supreme effort for collective action? And will they be able to meet, before Hitler forbids international gatherings?"

### *Second Session of Supreme Soviet*

The Second Session of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR opened on 10 August and closed on 21 August. Among the decisions taken the following are important.—adoption of the 1938 budget, a new law governing the election of judges, the election of a Supreme Court for the Soviet Union, a law regarding citizenship in the Soviet Union, a law

providing for the ratification or denunciation of international treaties, a new nation-wide tax on horses.

The law on citizenship amplifies and explains statements in the "Stalin" constitution. It provides that a citizen of any republic is a citizen of the whole Union. It defines the processes by which Soviet nationality may be acquired or dispensed with. For the first time, it deals with the problem of persons without citizenship.

#### *Elections to Supreme Soviets of Union and Autonomous Republics*

During June each of the 11 republics forming the Soviet Union, and the 22 autonomous republics, held elections to choose Supreme Councils for their respective governments. In Armenia-Georgia the election took place on 12 June, in the autonomous republics on 24 June, and in RSFSR, Ukraine and White Russia on 26 June.

Preparation for the elections was specially emphasised on these occasions, and most reports draw comparisons between these elections and those for the Supreme Council of the Soviet Union held on 12 December, 1937. The measures taken at that time were improved and applied to the June elections. Special groups for the study of the constitution and the election laws were organised throughout the Union; in Georgia for example 42,000 such study circles, including 1,400,000 voters, are reported. Another form of preparation for the elections was carried out by means of a large number of "agitators," especially qualified to instruct and interest the public. In Moscow there was one such agitator for every 50 voters, and in the Ryazan district a total of 28,400 agitators.

The activities of these agitators were varied. They organised and addressed meetings. They conducted discussion groups. Excursions were organised where voters visited factories and social institutions. In most factories and offices special agitation-points were set up, using posters, personal instruction and distribution of literature. In many parts of the country house-to-house visitations were carried out, and one special feature was the widely publicised exchange of correspondence between similar institutions, factories, collective farms, etc., in different parts of the Union, e.g. Georgia and Ukraine.

Participation in the elections was reported as reaching new high levels. In some sections 99.9 per cent. of all those eligible cast their votes. In only two autonomous republics, the Tartar and the Yakut, did the percentage drop below 99 per cent. Among the 1,500,000 participating in the election-commissions, 30 per cent. were women. Since the election the educational work carried on by "agitators" has been continued, using the methods noted above.

#### *The 1938 Budget*

On 24 August the Law for the Unified State Budget for 1938 was published ("Financial Gazette") as amended and adopted by the second session of the Supreme Council. Discussion was based on the project presented by Zverev, Commissary of Finances ("Financial Gazette,"

12 August). Both these documents must be taken into consideration in picturing the situation, since Zverev's report is more detailed than the Budget Law, although seeming to diverge from it in several points.

The 1938 budget resembles those for previous years in showing a favourable balance of over a billion roubles. Like previous budgets, it includes the finances of the Soviet Union as a whole, of the autonomous Republics of which it is formed, and of local governments. It differs from those of previous years in two respects. Instead of being published in January, as has been the case for the past five years (save 1934, when it appeared on 9 February), it is adopted and published this year in August. The second difference is in form. Whereas most of the budgets of recent years have been presented in a fairly uniform and standard system, that for 1938 is less concise and clear.

The debates in the Supreme Council differed somewhat from similar debates in the parliaments of democratic states. It was apparently arranged in advance that a representative of every Republic of the Union should speak. All speeches began with tributes to Stalin and the Soviet economic and financial system. General questions about the budget meeting the present needs of the country, or the wisdom of the proposed distribution of expenditures, or the country's capacity to pay the taxes required, were not raised, the discussion being limited to points of local interest or criticism of past budget appropriations. As a result of the debates, the budget was readjusted by the comparatively small amount of a billion roubles.

As adopted, the Budget Law for 1938 does not offer much detail in either income or expenditures. It indicates a sum total of income of 132.6 billion roubles, and total expenditure of 131.1 billion roubles. The budget for the Soviet Union was adopted in the sum of 97.8 billion roubles of income and 96.3 billion roubles of expenditures. The budgets of the Constituent Republics of the Union, make up a total of 26.3 billion roubles, and those of local governments a total of 8.4 billion roubles. The major source of income (over 70 per cent.) is from turnover and profit taxes. Other items listed cover less than 10 per cent., leaving about 20 per cent. budgeted income as yet unaccounted for.

On the expense side, the budget law gives few details, and hence we must again refer to the outline in Zverev's report. Here the figures are as follows :—

National economy ...	...	47.2 billion roubles
Social-cultural undertakings	...	12.1 „ „
Defence ... ..	...	27 „ „
Commissariat of the Interior	..	4.3 „ „
Administration and courts	...	2.7 „ „
Service of loans ..	...	2.0 „ „
Reserve funds .. ..	...	1.2 „ „
Other expenditures	... ..	0.6 „ „

Considering the expenditures under national economy, it is interesting to compare the similar outlay last year. The items are .

	1938	1937
Industry ... ..	19 8	15.3
Agriculture .	10.9	8.8
Transport and communications .	6.7	7.2
Trade and supply .. ..	2.8	2 3
Miscellaneous .. .	7.0	5.7
	<hr/> 47.2	<hr/> 39.3

The considerable increase in outlay for industry is in line with previous budgets and indicates that the policy of subsidising new industries regardless of the income from those already established, is to continue. This is confirmed by further study of the report of the finance commissar. For new construction 24.8 billion roubles is assigned. Another item is 5.4 billion roubles for increasing operating funds. It is explained in this connection that various industries have had to use part of their working funds to cover "deficits above the plan." These two items account for 30.2 billion roubles. The balance of 17 billion roubles is not accounted for in the Finance Commissary's report. We may assume that it will be used directly to cover the 1938 deficit on the general operation of national economy.

In relation to the expenditure for defence, the following comparison of budget totals and defence outlay since 1934 indicates that Soviet Russia is no more able to escape the present world race in armaments than any other country.

	Total expenditures	Expenditure on defence
	<i>Rbbs.</i>	<i>Rbbs.</i>
1934 .. ..	52.4	5.0
1935 ... ..	68.1	8.2
1936 .. ...	86.3	14.9
1937 ... ..	103.1	17.4
1938 .. ...	131.1	27.0

The appropriation for social cultural institutions (including social insurance and physical education as well as schools and public health) is very significant. It has increased nearly 33 per cent. over last year. And to the 12 billion roubles in the United budget must be added over 19 billion included in local budgets, bringing the total expenditures in 1938 for cultural and social operations to over 31 billion.

The only other significant increases in expenditures over those of 1937 are in the items for the Commissariat of Interior and for the law-courts, the two institutions directly concerned with the struggle against "enemies of the people."



In Russia, as in capitalist countries, budget balance evidently depends upon efficient and generous production, since a large part of the budgeted income is drawn from taxes on profits and turnover. And, as elsewhere, in a world plunged by rearmament into what amounts to a war-time situation, the balance apparently needs to be assured by the usual war-time procedures, loans or some form of inflation.

#### *Internal Loan*

The Soviet press reports the "successful" flotation of a new 4 per cent. 20 year internal loan of 5 billion roubles "for industry and defence." This was issued on 2 July by publication of a government order. Added to the state loans still outstanding at the beginning of 1938, this brings the total internal obligations of the government to 25.9 billion roubles. The Soviet press comments on the smallness of this amount as compared with the State budget, but, in comparing this with the analogous situation in other countries, neglects to remark that the Soviet budget represents practically the nation's entire income, whereas, abroad, the budget gives the total expenditure for government apparatus only. Over 50 million individuals or groups in Russia own bonds for these State obligations.

#### *New Tax on Horses*

In view of the fact that horses are used as special sources of income by their owners, chiefly in the case of citizens not members of a collective farm, a new tax on horses in individual ownership was decreed on 20 August. The amount of the tax varies in different parts of the Soviet Union, but the principles of application are uniform. Thus there is a tax of 400-500 roubles annually on one horse, but if a man owns two, he must pay 700-800 on the second. Sale of horses now will not free their former owners from payment of the tax for 1938. If individual owners join a collective farm before 15 October and put their stock into the common fund, it is proposed that they shall not be required to pay the 1938 tax.

#### *Preparations for the Census*

Considerable attention is given in the Soviet press to preparation for the new census to be taken in January, 1939. There are articles explaining the importance of the census, not only nationally, but internationally. The chief criticism now made of the census of 1937, which was annulled, is that it gave a total number of the population smaller than the reality, and the chief purpose of the new census is stated to be not to miss a single person in the whole Soviet Union. The census is to begin on 17 January and to continue seven days in towns and cities and ten days in the country. Over 400,000 agents will be employed in taking the census. Sixteen questions are to be answered by each person, the replies being written into the blank by the census taker. Besides the usual census questions—age, sex, nationality, citizenship, mother-tongue, married or single,

what education, place and type of employment—questions peculiar to the Soviet census concern the person's relation to his family, the social class to which he belongs, and his permanent address if the present one is temporary.

### *New Efforts in Coal-Mining*

On 21 October, an order was published giving new regulations for the coal-mining industry. Stating, first, that coal production in general lags behind the plan, the document orders: immediate increase in mechanisation of the mining industry; intensified exploitation of areas hitherto of small importance, East and West Siberia, Kazakstan, Transcaucasia and Central Asia, a special six-months course of training in the use of machines, open to chosen miners, to be organised in five of the most important mining regions, the organisation of special party committees in each mine to promote discipline, increase individual production and "battle with the enemies of the people."

The order further urges all local authorities to use all possible efforts to supply their needs in coal from sources close at hand, thus diminishing the long transport of fuel which is such a burden on Soviet economy. The coal production plan for 1939 is to be ready by 1 November, 1938.

### *Plan for Stock-breeding, 1938*

The State plan for stock-breeding in 1938 was published on 18 June. As in all other phases of the national economy it proposes a marked increase in production over previous years. The emphasis is placed particularly, this year, on better breeding and increased productivity. The total number of horses in the Soviet Union is to be increased by 7 per cent., cattle by 10 per cent., swine by 19 per cent., sheep by 17 per cent. and goats by 16 per cent. The plan covers both stock in the collective farms, and that owned by individuals, members of the collectives. A comparison of these figures is interesting. Thus, while the cattle in the ownership of collective farms are to be increased by 4.4 million, those in private ownership are to be increased by 8.1 million. For sheep the figures are 8.8 million and 12.7 million respectively, and 5.8 as against 14.8 for swine. This further increases the difference between the total live stock owned collectively, and that in private ownership.

### *Three Years of Stakhanovism*

The first mining record was made by Alexis Stakhanov on 30 August, 1935. The celebration of the third anniversary of Stakhanovism this year was the occasion for a review of its results in Soviet economy. In the first year production in industry increased 21 per cent. It is expected that the 15 per cent. increase projected for 1938 will be realised.

The percentage of "Stakhanovites" has also increased. In heavy industry there were 14.5 per cent. in 1935, while in 1938 the percentage was 35. Thus Stakhanovism is approaching a position where it is the rule rather than the exception. Its chief result has been to increase the

norm of production per individual. Three factors have aided in this: (a) the availability of modern instruments, (b) the more efficient organisation of workers engaged in a particular process, and (c) a different attitude of workers toward their tasks.

### *Aviation*

On 28 June, two Soviet aviators, Vladimir Kokkinaky and Alexander Bryandinsky, flew non-stop from Moscow to a station near Vladivostok, a distance of 7,600 kilometres, in 24 hours 36 minutes. This is the greatest long-distance flight ever made within one country.

On 2 July, three women army flyers, Paulina Osipenko, Vera Lomako and Maria Raskova, made a non-stop flight Sevastopol-Archangel (2,416 kilometres) in 10 hours 33 minutes.

On 7 October, three women military aviators (two of the above with Valentina Grisodubova, replacing V. Lomako) broke all women's records for non-stop flight by covering the distance between Moscow and a spot on the Amur river where they made a forced landing—5,947 kilometres in a direct line. The previous record held by Madame Dupeyron was 4,360 kilometres (time 26 hours 29 minutes).

On 17 August Colonel Charles Lindbergh visited Moscow and was enthusiastically received. The Soviet Press changed its attitude toward Lindbergh completely, however, during the Czechoslovak crisis, when much abuse was heaped on his head for his reported derogatory statements about Soviet aviation.

On 18 August, the Soviet Day of Aviation, reports published gave data on the growth of civil aviation. Since 1938 the distance covered per year has increased almost five times (1933, 11 million kilometres; 1937, 54.7 million kilometres). The number of passengers carried rose from 42,800 in 1933 to 211,787 in 1937, while freight carried increased during the same period from 1,452 to 36,885 tons.

### *The Comsomol*

On 29 October the Comsomol (Communist Youth League) celebrated its 20th anniversary. The Press devoted much space to the event, and a meeting was held in the Great Theatre in Moscow, attended by most of the leading figures in the Soviet Government, including Stalin, Molotov, Voroshilov, Kaganovich and Kosarev, Secretary of the Central Committee of the Comsomol, who a week later was to be under arrest.

### *Death of Stanislavsky*

Constantine Stanislavsky, with Nemirovitch-Danchenko the creator of the Moscow Art Theatre, died on 7 August. His death closes the career of one of the most prominent figures in the Russian dramatic world, whether before or after the Revolution. Born in 1862, he devoted himself from his youth to the study and production of drama. One of his earliest successes was the production in 1891 of Tolstoy's *Fruits of Enlightenment*.

*Death of Kuprin*

Alexander Ivanovitch Kuprin died in Leningrad on 25 August. One of the best known of contemporary Russian authors, he returned from emigration a year ago, already in serious ill-health. Noted principally for his short stories with exceptionally clear pictures of life as he saw it, Kuprin was also the author of longer novels.

*Religion*

The new "Antireligious text book" for study circles or self-education was issued by the State Antireligious Publishing Co. in an edition of 100,000. The notice on the title-page states its contents as follows: "the essential material on basic questions of antireligious propaganda, on the history of religion . . . on the political rôle of religious organisations in the USSR, and in bourgeois countries. . . . It may serve as a handbook for propagandists and speakers in mass antireligious propaganda." The first such textbook appeared during the first Five Year Plan and sold about 700,000 copies, but has been out of print for the past five years.

## REVIEWS

"*Protokoly Sionskikh Mudretsov.*" *Dokazanny Podlog* ("Protocols of the Elders of Sion": a proved forgery) by V. L. Burtsev. Oreste Zeluk: Paris, 1938.

HAVING heard that a new book on the "Protocols" had appeared, but not by whom, my first impulse was to ask, what use is it? Reasoning beings know that the Protocols are a forgery, and the others are impenetrable by logic. Also I knew of at least two books in preparation on it. The eminence of the author and the contents of the book are a sufficient answer. But the *résumé* printed in our *Review* does not do justice to the book.

This book falls into two parts, which are uneven in quality and quantity. The pages, down to p. 52, are a summary of the history of the forgery as given in Delevsky, and seem dry to one who knows the rather dramatic way in which Delevsky puts it.

There are, however, even here points important to note. One is that Krushevan's priority in publishing the text rather spoils the variant stories put forth by Nilus and confirms the assertion, not in Delevsky, that a Russian version was printed at the press of one of the Ministries and copies given to Nilus and other "hopeful" people, presumably including Krushevan. This recalls Prince Urusov's experience at Kishinev. Incidentally it clears Nilus of the suggestion that he had composed it in Russian himself.<sup>1</sup>

The assertion that the Black Hundreds got their sequence of government systems from Plato (p. 19) is unnecessary. They could quite

<sup>1</sup> Krushevan organised a pogrom in Kishinev. The liberal Prince Urusov was Governor there. Both were later members of the First Duma (1906) where Urusov denounced pogroms.

easily get it from Pobedonostsev, whom they quote anyhow—or from any elementary treatise on Greek theories of government. The idea of an “exchange (*valuta*) of the cost of labour force instead of the gold standard” was in fact not merely an idea of the Owenists and of Proudhon, but also actually of Napoleon III. Julian de Medrano’s *Silva Curiosa* (p. 21) did not print the letters to and from Constantinople for the first time. Part of the story occurred much earlier in a sham decree of a King, against some rebels who concocted an anti-Marrano pamphlet in the shape of a privilege, allowing Marranos to do most of the things specified in the Constantinople letters. This version has a curious history on the track of which I am working. The adaptation cited by the Abbé Bous must have been adjusted to the accession of Louis XI in Provence. The extreme thinness of the matter in Drumont, whose reference to the “Letters” I have been unable to find, and his jerky movements from vague rhodomontade to ludicrous precision are still not to my mind good enough to include him as one of the cooks of the broth, although he might have demoralised the intellect and morals of the operators by his works.

It is not necessary to make much of the Retcliffe business. Slight errors exist in Delevsky and here, but the facts are clear. The amusing case of Butmi quoting Retcliffe to prove Retcliffe, as it were, (pp. 30–31) is even bettered by the publishers of one edition of the “Protocols,” who issued what they called Four Protocols—not of Nilus—which were just the Constantinople letters and other matter that had been taken into the machinery of the “Protocols.” They also spoke of them as authentic and original, although, as I have noted above, the forged decree of fifty years earlier contains most of the clauses, albeit in a different framework.

The references to the Will of Peter the Great (p. 31) are of great interest. A hint in another quarter set me to searching that work of fiction, and it is amazingly like our Protocols. I found a French authority who gave strong reasons for thinking that Napoleon I ordered its composition and dictated some of the phrases used. Indeed he spoke so confidently about the touch of Napoleon’s style that I sought independent evidence about this style, and fell upon a book of conversations with Napoleon III. which amply confirms Joly’s criticism of Napoleon III’s foreign policy. What is especially curious is that the different editions of the Will say that it was found in a palace whose name varies from Oranienburg to Gatchina and Tsarskoe Selo. Here also we have the characteristic of the forger, as in Nilus’s and Krushevan’s accounts of the provenance of the Protocols.

What follows deals with Joly as the principal source, noting at p. 41 the amusing blunder of referring to a “new Republican constitution,” due to the slavish copying of Joly. The statements as to authorship and date are important and interesting (pp. 42–5).

On page 46 Burtsev touches the "Taina Evreistva," but curtly and imperfectly, and does not make its preparatory rôle clear, nor note Stolypin's indignant rejection of such methods, worded so nearly identically with the later condemnation of the Protocols by Nicholas II, which is one of the high lights of this book, though less reassuring than one would like. The rest, to p. 52, is simply a paraphrase of Delevsky.

Burtsev's short history of anti-Semitism in Russia shows that Nicholas I simply ridiculed the Ritual Murder accusation. There is a long and valuable discussion of the delusion that "the Jews" lead the Socialist and other movements and use them for their purposes.

First, most of these so-called Jews are neither in blood nor religion Jews and have no more relation with the real Jews than the reactionaries themselves.

Much more important from many points of view is the passage beginning at p. 69 on the attitude of Russian Society and of the Russian Government to the Protocols. This was that they were just a forgery. Burtsev's journal *Byloe* refused to criticise them at all. His own personal attitude at that time is of interest. He says that, as a historian accustomed to handling documents, he could see that it was a forgery and no document. Further, he was in such close touch with all sorts of Jewish circles that he could not be ignorant of any such conspiracy, if it really existed. In 1905 or so, the greatest patrons of the Protocols and the most enthusiastic advocates of their use as propaganda never pretended to believe in their genuineness, and systematically evaded all attempts at discussion of it. There were no defenders of it either in Russian society, in Government circles, or in Church spheres. They were further ignored in the literary world and in society, and only spoken of with contempt.

On pp. 73 sq. is an interesting list of members of the Police Department who regarded the "Protocols" as forgeries, A. A. Lopukhin even naming Rachkovsky as the author and as the worst of *agents provocateurs*. I. F. Manasevich-Manuilov spoke with incredulous contempt of believers in the "Protocols" as idiots. Further, he said the Government would never defend or use them. In fact, the Tsar's Government never did either. He spoke of Golovinsky as an adventurer, a criminal type and an agent of Rachkovsky. Almost the most interesting is the long and lively account of Burtsev's conversations—as fellow-prisoners under the Bolsheviks—with S. P. Beletsky, another distinguished police officer concerned with the Beilis case.

The account of General Subbotin, pp. 82-3, is an exception. He is an anti-Semite and propagates the "Protocols," but he never hesitated to employ the services of the local Jews against the Bolsheviks in Crimea.

The honourable attitude of Denikin and Romanovsky Burtsev rightly contrasts with their folly in tolerating the circulation of the "Protocols" by some of their officers—which cost them dear. It is

further made clear that Wrangel took the right view, but his surroundings were so hopelessly anti-Semitic as to account for the way that the anti-Bolshevik cause was prejudiced in Crimea. This information is based on talks that immediately preceded that catastrophe.

A general survey of the period after October, 1917, follows, which deserves study. What is, however, of more importance is Burtsev's account of his own enquiry into the question in 1920 and after. It contains some startling things. Thus Kurlov admitted that the "Protocols" were a forgery, but said it was committed before Rachkovsky's time, and seems to have some knowledge of the Note of 1895 (the "Secret of Jewry")

Another man in Belgium knew Nilus and believed he was telling the truth and that the things were genuine. But which story? Burtsev gives an interesting account of how he extracted information in 1934 from one G. through one K (G. seems to be General Gerasimov, the French edition of whose memoirs throws a strange light on the last years of the Russian monarchy) Burtsev, on pp. 103 sq. gives the questions he put to K. and the answers, with the date. One of the most interesting is the unforeseen answer to a question about the attitude of important people, where Nicholas is said to have forbidden their use with the remark "It is impossible to do a clean deed with dirty means." The resemblance of this to Stolypin's indignant refusal to allow the use of the preparatory document, the *Zapiska*, or "Secret of Jewry," I have noted above, but unluckily the clean deed or holy thing is anti-Semitism.

In Burtsev's account of the propaganda of the "Protocols" abroad and the struggle against them, it is interesting to find among the anti-Semites who came to Germany in 1918-1919 G. Bostunich, who published about that time a "prophecy" full of attacks on Great Britain. He subsequently became a German citizen, and took a German name. F. Vinberg, who is named as one of this group, published an attempt to defend the "Protocols." They were responsible for the publication in 1918 of the first German translation. This was by a German named von Hansen, who used the pseudonym of Beek. They also inspired the Balt A. Rosenberg, who became the associate of Hitler as the propagator of the "Protocols." They issued at the same time thousands of copies of three editions of them, with three different accounts of their origin (p. 112)! Special German organisations were established for their propaganda, carried on at the cost of the State not only in Germany but abroad. Hitler's agents found appropriate publishers abroad and spent amazing sums on them.

The first English translation appeared in 1920, and there were five other editions. In 1921 Victor Marsden published a new version, of which several editions appeared. The *Morning Post* and *The Times* published a series of articles in defence of their authenticity. In France also, in 1920, there appeared one after another editions of the "Protocols" in French, issued by Drumont's *Libre Parole* and Urbain

Gohier's *La Vieille France* The most energetic propaganda was conducted by Father Jouin in his journal, and by Roger Lambellan (who made his own version). After these L. Frey published her much-discussed work. There was renewed anti-Semitic propaganda in France in 1933, which we may well connect with Hitler's seizure of power in Germany.

In 1920 again an English edition was issued in Boston, U.S.A. Henry Ford's articles about the Protocols in his journals and his half-million edition of them are mentioned. This was translated into various languages and had a tremendous circulation in Germany. The influences behind this were not only the Russian anti-Semites living in Germany, but also others living in America, such as Boris Brazol and Cherep-Spiridovich. A list of the other languages in which they appeared is given

Simultaneously with all this, there appeared attacks on Paris and elsewhere. Important services were rendered by Milyukov, Yu. Delevsky, Shozberg and Reinach in Paris, and in London Lucien Wolf. The revelations of *The Times* had the greater influence because of the change of view they showed. The Conference of Jewish American Organisations issued a protest against the "Protocols" over the signatures of Wilson, Katz, Th. Roosevelt, Bryan and others. Herman Bernstein not only published a book about them, but brought a successful action against Henry Ford, who afterwards published an apology and prohibited the publication or sale of his anti-Semitic publications (which did not stop their sale in Germany).

The account of the Berne hearings is important, not because it makes the fraudulent character of the "Protocols" more evident to any competent student, but because the main facts were proved in the face of the whole world, the worthless nature of the defence of them was shown, and the character of their defenders shown in a strange light, both as regards their moral delinquency in individual cases and stupidity in swearing to statements which were manifestly false. I do not see how I can criticise it here, but it has given me fresh points from which to search for new matter. The only point the defenders produced that was at all cogent was the weakness of the Radziwill-Herblette evidence. The judgment of the Court (p. 158 & ff.) is of great interest.

As a result of inquiries following an unsuccessful appeal, it was found that the defenders were mixed up very closely with a famous group of spies and that the money for the defence came from Germany. Subsequent attempts to defend them are noted.

There are interesting comments on Azef and his relations with Rachkovsky and Gerasimov, especially the statement that Azef prepared a plan to assassinate the Tsar in 1908—by order—which failed for reason explained not here but in a work by V. Kaledin. Note that the Radziwill and Madame Herblette and others concerned had met *chez*



Madame Adam The suggestion that Du Chaila had never met Nilus is contradicted by Nilus himself.

The last two pages of the text contain a really important appeal, addressed to all honest people—and it is to my mind specially incumbent on Gentiles who are genuine Christians—to fight against that foul abomination, anti-Semitism, whose own most conspicuous English advocate rightly ridiculed the bogus scientific name “anti-Semitism,” though unaware of its German origin

L. E. WHARTON

*Brest Litovsk. The Forgotten Peace (March 1918).* By John W. Wheeler-Bennett (Macmillan) 1938. 21s. net Pp 478

MR. WHEELER-BENNETT has performed a public service in writing this book, which is the first serious attempt in England to tell in its political and diplomatic aspects the story of how the war ended on the Eastern front. But it is far more than this. It has all the freshness of historical work supplemented by personal contacts, and its author has discussed many aspects of this tangled period of Russian history, with “all those participants in Brest Litovsk who were still alive,” German and Russian alike, including Trotsky, Radek and Kuhlmann and those gifts of psychological insight, which were so apparent in his earlier volume on Hindenburg, are again strongly in evidence.

The three opening chapters show very clearly the fatal dilemma confronting the Provisional Government and the shortsighted attitude of the Allies in demanding the impossible from men who were thoroughly loyal to Western ideals, but had to deal with an utterly warworn nation and a disintegrating political machine. The problem of peace was the vital test for the Kerensky Government, and remained so for Lenin after the November Revolution; and Sir George Buchanan never showed greater insight than when he advocated releasing Russia from her obligations to the Allies, on the ground that the July offensive, which had been ordered under pressure of the West, had “merely opened the way for a substantial German advance” and had also given a very material stimulus to extremist revolutionary tendencies, that “to *faire bonne mine à mauvais jeu* was the only course now open to the Entente Powers,” and that a bid should be made “for continued good relations with the Soviet Government,” in the calculation that “national resentment in Russia would turn against Germany if too onerous terms were demanded.” Mr. Lloyd George laid Buchanan’s proposals before the Allies, Mr. Balfour was also tully alive to the danger of a Russo-German rapprochement, and Colonel House gave his support, but Clemenceau, backed by Sonnino, secured their rejection.

Mr. Wheeler-Bennett moves surefootedly to and fro between Russia and Germany, showing how Lenin misjudged the revolutionary currents in the West, and especially in Germany, how the Soviet delegates to

Brest were above all concerned to use their meetings "as a sounding board for the propagation of their doctrine," how the "comedy of 'no annexation'" was played by Kuhlmann and Czernin, and how the German High Command played the dominant part in all Eastern policy and at times overrode and even denounced Gen. Hoffmann, whose bull-headed figure stands out of the narrative. We are given a very clear account of Lenin's attitude as soon as he realised that a world revolution was not as near as he had hoped. "The world revolution was a dream which might in time be realised, the Russian Revolution was a fact which must at all costs be defended and consolidated, and to this end Lenin bent his mental efforts, leaving to Trotsky and his fellow enthusiasts the task of turning the Conference at Brest Litovsk into a sounding-board for the advocacy of Marxism and the gospel of revolution" (p. 139). Trotsky's rôle is less clear, for the simple reason that he wavered between rival manœuvres from an offer to the Allies to cut off the Germans from raw materials, to his Carrollian idea of "ending war without signing peace," to his sudden rash avowal to Czernin that he was "not greatly concerned as to what they took, but rather as to how they took it." Finally the issue was forced upon Trotsky by Lenin. The first refusal to sign had given the Germans their chance of advancing farther into the heart of Russia; this time they must sign at once, to save the revolution, otherwise they might be driven to the Urals. As for himself, Lenin was playing "a game which had no rules," and his attitude to "a Tilsit Peace" was the crudest possible:—"I don't mean to read it, and I don't mean to fulfil it, except in so far as I'm forced." To him the choice was between "the brigands of the Entente and the brigands of the Central Powers."

No less clearly does Mr. Wheeler-Bennett bring out the insincerity of the German attitude—the plea that Bolshevism must be destroyed, merely put forward as a cloak to cover the annexation of the Baltic provinces. Unfortunately for themselves and still more for the Austrians, the Germans could not get the grain and food supplies of Ukraine without keeping an army there to requisition and collect them, and to cope with growing difficulties of transport and with the passive resistance of the peasantry. Even the murder of Gen. Eichhorn could not avail to dispel the "Napoleonic complex" of Ludendorff. "Paranoia had him in its grip. . . . He maintained his hold upon the Ukraine until defeat in the West forced him to loosen it and abandon Skoropadsky to his fate." Incidentally it was Ludendorff who at this stage coined the ominous phrase—worthy of comparison with certain passages in Hitler's *Mein Kampf*: "German prestige demands that we should hold a strong protecting hand, not only over German citizens, but over *all* Germans." Of quite special interest is the account of the German attitude towards the Ukrainian problem, to the shadowy Rada and its delegates, and to the Hetman Skoropadsky, then as now a mere instrument of Berlin's Eastern ambitions.

The closing chapter describes the Nemesis which Brest Litovsk brought upon the Germans, first in the fact that the will-o'-the-wisps of Russian partition and of Ukrainian foodstuffs kept a million troops immobilised in the East, when they might perhaps have decided the "break through" attempted in the West, and secondly in the fact that the treaty's draconic character did more than anything else to win President Wilson for the policy of "Integral Victory." "I accept the challenge," he said on 6 April 1918: "Germany has once more said that force alone shall decide whether Justice and Peace shall reign in the affairs of man . . . There is therefore but one response possible for us . . . the righteous and triumphant Force which shall make Right the law of the world. . . ." And in the decisive reply of the Allies to Germany's appeal of 27 September came Wilson's reminder that Brest and Bucarest made it impossible "to come to terms." The book closes with the phrase (*à propos* of the annulment of those two treaties as part of the armistice terms), "In comparison with the mountain of their shame this was but a pebble, but it was the pebble of Brest-Litovsk upon which their feet had stumbled."

The value of the book is greatly enhanced by appendices, bibliography and illustrations.

R. W. SETON-WATSON.

*Kopernik, Twórca Nowego Nieba* (Copernicus, Creator of a New Heaven).

By Jeremi Wasiutyński. Warszawa, 1938, Przeworski. Pp. 666. With 125 illustrations and a map.

*Copernicus, the Founder of Modern Astronomy.* By Angus Armitage. London, 1938, Allen and Unwin. Pp. 183.

*Nicolaus Copernicus und der Deutsche Ritterorden.* By Ludwik Birkenmayer. Cracow, 1937, T.M.K. Pp. 39.

*Comment Copernic a-t-il conçu et réalisé son œuvre ?* By Alex. Birkenmayer. Warsaw, 1936, in *Organon*, Annual of Mianowski Foundation. Pp. III-134.

Of the lives of some of the greatest servants of mankind we know very little indeed. Partly, no doubt, because the nature of their contribution was only discerned when they were gone. They attracted little attention from their fellows, and died in obscurity. The more surely, if their work was not acceptable, or was even a stone of stumbling.

This was the fate of Nicholas Copernicus. In 1943 the world of science will celebrate the four-hundredth anniversary of his death, but to the mass even of educated people he is a name and nothing more. Until recently there existed, so far as I know, only one worthy study of the great man's life and work: the two-volume colossus of Leopold Prowe, published in 1883-84 in Berlin. The late Ludwik Birkenmayer, for long years professor in the University of Cracow, devoted half a lifetime to combing the libraries of Europe, particularly of the north, for any scraps of information about Copernicus, or about his books—which had been

carried off to Sweden by the officers of Gustavus Adolphus in 1626. But he never was able to finish the biography which would set a crown on his labours. Numerous pamphlets and a couple of larger volumes—the last in 1923, *Siromata Copernicana*—are all that he left us

Something like a definitive survey has at last come from the pen of a young Polish astronomer, Jeremi Wasiutyński, and it is interesting to be able to couple with it the much smaller study of an English investigator, Mr. Armitage. Few books have been awaited by a nation with more interest than Wasiutyński's, and the author himself was largely to blame. In one or two occasional papers he had broached issues that started a hot discussion. For one thing he nursed certain views about the astronomer (it is said under the influence of Kretschmer's book on "Geniuses"), which we may call Freudian. For another, he showed himself indifferent to the 19th century controversy as to whether Copernicus was a German or a Pole. I shall return to these matters in the sequel, but first a few of the salient facts about the subject of these books.

Born in Torun (Thorn) on the lower Vistula, of a father of like name, who had moved from Cracow some years earlier, and of a mother, Barbara, née Watzenrode, he was schooled in Włocławek (not in Torun, as Armitage says), and went on in 1491 to the already famous University of Cracow. After four years in his father's home city, he was sent by his uncle, since 1489 Bishop of Ermland, to Italy for higher studies. Here, with slight interruptions, he remained till 1504. first in Bologna, then—after the Jubilee year in Rome—in Padua. He took his Doctor's degree in Ferrara in 1503. Throughout, his fields of study had been prescribed for him—law, and medicine, so that his love for mathematics and astronomy was called on to stand much testing. Made a Canon of his uncle's diocese in 1498, he could return in 1504 to a safe living, and with the prospect of at least some leisure to pursue his own interests farther.

Actually he made himself a most important place as a citizen of his country. Helping in public affairs, both legislative and economic, he could turn if necessary from his duties as a churchman to organise the defence of Allenstein against the Teutonic Knights—the scourge of that part of Europe. He is even believed to have planned the waterworks of more than one of the towns of East Prussia. His Treatise on a Proper Coinage, needed in the face of scandalous debasing by the authorities, has a value as an economic treatise even today. All in all, the man showed himself, in his quiet way, to be scarcely less a master of all the sciences than the incomparable Leonardo da Vinci himself. His major interest, however, remained the investigation of the Ptolemaic System and the preparation of his *magnum opus*, *De Revolutionibus Orbium Coelestium Libri VI*, which was to appear in the year of his death.

As a mathematician Birkenmayer was most anxious to ferret out the stages by which Master Nicholas arrived at his conclusions, so revolting to all his contemporaries. He made it clear that each institution, thanks to its eminent teachers, contributed something distinctive. By 1504, it

seems, he was already sure of his goal; and could proceed very soon to the writing of *Commentariolus*, which we now know to have been composed many years earlier than was supposed after its discovery in 1876. It is one of the surprises of history that the man who sought out the Polish sage, to determine how much truth there was in the rumours going about, was a young Lutheran professor, Rheticus, from Wittenberg, and the story of how after two years he brought away the MS of the Master's great work and saw to its being published in Nurnberg, has been told many times. Not least surprising was the "failure of nerve" of Rheticus, and the misunderstandings that followed.

Wasiutyński has given us this whole story on a vast background of Renaissance thought and life. We are introduced to endless men and women of distinction, in an age that was pulsing with life in every field. The book, in contrast to, though often profiting from, the ponderous learning of Plowe, is written with a light hand, and can be read by the average person without difficulty. At the same time an immense amount of research has gone into it; not a single point, however tiny, has been taken on faith from any previous investigator. Notable are the occasions in which the younger Pole differs from his older compatriot, Birkenmayer.

As for the controversies mentioned above, Wasiutyński ventures the belief that Copernicus was not a normal man, had in fact a "split" personality. This increased his powers rather than inhibited them. It is put down in part to mixture of blood. Neither of the two men living in his frame had much in common with the pious "myth" that had been reared about him from the time when Napoleon surprised the people of Torun in 1807 by asking them about their eminent townsman. What has stirred up most dispute, however, is the question of nationality. About it too much has been written, most of it worth little. Both sides of the house, meeting in Torun, came from Upper Silesia originally, which is as perfect an example of a *Zwischenland* as can be found, with a minimum of purity of race or forebears. One thing, and one only, matters. Both schooling and university years were Polish. His whole later life in East Prussia showed his loyalty to the Polish crown, and his intense enmity toward the Teutonic Knights. Conjecture is admissible, but no evidence is known which can establish something that, in the days of Humanism, mattered little anyway.

Mr. Armitage's book is devoted almost entirely to Copernicus the scientist. It will meet a real need, but I do feel that twice as long a chapter on the man and the citizen would have enriched the book greatly. After all Copernicus was a practical benefactor of his people in more ways than one. The author does not seem to know of the work done by Birkenmayer during the war and post-war years. A pity, for he would have found much to interest him—chiefly in Polish, it is true. There are a number of errors in fact. It is inadmissible to say that Cracow was founded by Germans!

The two papers by the Birkenmayers, *pater et filius*, are noted because each of them has something worth while to say to the student who cannot read Polish. Nothing is more certain than that interest will grow in the coming years as to the whole life struggle of him "who stayed the sun and set the earth in motion." The year 1943 should help on the cause.

W. J. ROSE.

*The Thirty Years War.* By C. V. Wedgwood. London, 1938 (Jonathan Cape). Pp. 544. 18s. net.

Miss Wedgwood, greatly daring, has produced that account of the most tragic war in modern times which no English writer has hitherto had the courage or the application to produce. and the result is at one and the same time scholarly and readable. Perhaps the most satisfactory feature of the book is its success in drawing the characters of leading statesmen and soldiers. Curiously enough Wallenstein, usually presented in high lights in the centre of the stage, finds himself more in the background, while great attention is paid to Ferdinand II, so long an "object of faintly contemptuous pity," and yet knowing "how to wait and when to drift," and getting what he wanted time after time, in the teeth of many disadvantages, thanks, doubtless, above all to his "underlying fanaticism." There is a clear estimate of Ferdinand's dilemma, between the interests of the Church, to which he was always so sincerely attached, and those of his dynasty, which were menaced by the Catholic League. "It is probable," we read, "that Ferdinand, being a simple man, and more given to exercise than thought, hardly conceived of the problem in explicit terms, but henceforward two motives dominated his policy: he must strengthen the Habsburg power in the dynastic lands themselves, and find means whenever possible to evade all further obligations to Maximilian of Bavaria. This he set out to achieve in the time conscientiously allotted to State affairs between prayers and hunting" (p. 165). Later in the book an attempt is made to bring out Ferdinand III's character: "quiet, thoughtful, rather melancholy," lacking in his father's singleness of purpose and also in the surprising good fortune which offset so many cruel reverses, he was "too clever to be happy, not clever enough to be successful."

No less interesting is the portrayal of the great Gustavus, whose terrific self-confidence hypnotised not only his followers but those who had never seen him, and whose wilful outbursts made negotiation very difficult. Miss Wedgwood does not challenge his position as champion of the Protestant cause, but is right to insist that parallel with this he was also really "the protagonist of Swedish expansion on German soil." He might clearly have become Emperor, despite the misgivings of the German Princes, and would almost certainly have made a bid for the Crown if he had lived. And indeed "the Swedish King, with his Baltic interest, his Protestant religion and his fluent German speech, was a no

less suitable Emperor than Ferdinand with his Spanish obligations, his Italian interests and his Catholic religion." But the explosive possibilities of so unmanageable a sovereign were unbounded, and Miss Wedgwood may be excused for doubting whether he would have mellowed with age "He left German politics, as he left her fields, a heap of shards."

The initial survey of German political and religious problems on the eve of the war is admirably conceived, and here, too, the influence of character is stressed for the utter inadequacy of the Winter King, Frederick V, was one of the main factors in the collapse of Bohemia. On the other hand, she seems to have been less interested in Christian IV of Denmark, who does not emerge very clearly from the narrative. Least clear of all is the character and rôle of Bernard of Saxe-Weimar in the period following the abortive Peace of Prague and this is partly because she regards the evidence as too inconclusive to permit a firm verdict on him as adventurer or patriot, and perhaps also because these later years are so definitely lacking in unity or in plan. After 1638 the war degenerates into one fought out by France and Spain on German soil.

The closing chapter contains a most interesting corrective to the common tendency to assume the complete devastation of Germany as the outcome of the war, though no attempt is made to minimise its appalling horrors.

Mistakes are only trifling. Carafa and Ragoczy should be Caraffa and Rákóczy. In the Austrian motto A.E.I.O.U. the "i" should be *imperare*, not *imperatura* (p. 23). Hus and Jerome were burnt in 1415 and 1416 respectively, not both in 1417 (p. 69). Surely it should be either "Valtellina" (the Italian form), or "the Valtelline" (Anglicised), but not "Val Telline." And is it not rather excessive to call Paul IV "the greatest of the Counter-Reformation Popes," to the exclusion of Pius V and Sixtus V, or again the Swedish General Banér "a coarse, outspoken ruffian"? There are 16 well-chosen illustrations and two rather less adequate maps.

R. W. SETON-WATSON.

*Ambassador to Bismarck: Lord Odo Russell* (1st Lord Ampthill). By Winifred Taffs, Ph.D. London (Frederick Muller, Ltd.), 1938. 15s. net. 410 pp.

It was high time that one of the really great ambassadors of last century should have his biography, and Miss Taffs is to be congratulated on producing so judicious and readable a volume. It is a matter for lively regret that Lord Odo's private papers should have been destroyed by his widow, in the mistaken view that reports originally penned for confidential use should under no circumstances be allowed to see the light. This attitude, which belongs to a vanished age, and is peculiarly out of place in post-war days, when the world is flooded with diplomatic documents, has unquestionably done grave injury to Lord Odo's memory by removing much that would redound to his credit and enhance his

reputation still further. Providentially his official dispatches to the Foreign Office, of which Miss Taffis has made very full and discerning use, provide irrefutable proof of his tact, farsightedness and diplomatic ability. The only criticism of the book is that it does not deal with Lord Odo's earlier career in Rome, where he made his mark during the difficult period of Pius IX's losing fight against Italian Unity and was one of his uncle Lord John's most valuable informants on Italian affairs.

Russell first arrived in Berlin in February 1872 and remained there till his premature death in 1884, and thus the opening years of his mission were filled with Bismarck's *Kulturkampf* against Rome, and with the quarrel between Bismarck and Arnim, which illustrated the Chancellor's vindictive character no less than his Ambassador's futility. Bismarck actually told Russell that Arnim was "a man who would poison his own father or steal a silver spoon without compunction." It is enlightening to find Bismarck accusing France of planning another war, preferring the Comte de Chambord to Marshal MacMahon as ruler of France, simply "because he was the greater fool of the two," and meeting Lord Odo's insistence on France's "weakened state," by declaring "that an excuse for war was easily found—he had some experience in such matters" (22 December, 1873, p. 66). Russell's report of 2 May, 1875, is the complete confirmation of the view that General Moltke and the high military were playing with the idea of a preventive war. Meanwhile both Bismarck and Bulow believed in fantastic tales of a Jesuit plot in Belgium, France and Italy against the German Empire. We shall never know the whole truth on this, but Miss Taffis' explanation is certainly the most plausible—that Bismarck was then in a state of extreme nerves, and hence highly credulous, and that both statesmen were misled by their spies and "secret sources" (p. 93). Andrassy, too, in speaking to Buchanan in Vienna, referred to the "nervous restlessness of Prince Bismarck, who, though always unscrupulous and cynical, had until lately acted with coolness and judgment, whereas within the last six months his good sense seemed to have entirely deserted him." The whole incident of the War Scare of 1875 is admirably summarised in all its aspects, Russian as well as German.

The central portion of the book (pp. 109–242) is concerned with the Eastern Crisis of 1875–8 and the Congress of Berlin; and here the main interest lies in the fact that Russell, almost alone in the Berlin diplomatic corps, contrived to establish close relations with Bismarck, who was at the most *difficile* and crotchety period of his whole career and often buried himself in the country for weeks at a time. A very telling proof of this influence, at a time when Disraeli quite wrongly blamed Russell for ineffectiveness, is the way in which Bismarck "poured out his soul" to Russell "in abuse of the latter's French colleague, Gontaut-Biron" (p. 117). In February 1878 we find Bismarck privately assuring Lord Odo that the whole German nation "wished for the friendship of England, and as long as he lived, he would promise that Germany would



never support any other Power against England" (p. 215). No less interesting is Bismarck's attitude to England in December 1881, agreeing "in all points with the policy of England, except in one, and that was in the philanthropic side of her policy. He believed that pressure for reforms could be overdone and actually did more harm than good, because the irritation produced on the Turkish mind by high foreign pressure manifested itself by increased procrastination and led to the very result it was so desirable to obviate" (p. 331) . . . "To press for administrative reforms which the Turks had not the capacity to carry out, being a military nation and nothing else, was simply playing the Russian game and breaking up the Turkish Empire" (pp. 331-2). Meanwhile, to Saburov Bismarck denied any objection to an Anglo-Russian alliance, but did not believe it would last (31 December, 1880, p. 340).

I have failed to detect serious misprints. "Strathedon" should be "Stratheden" (p. 127), and "Wassilitz" (p. 139) should be "Wesselitzky" (of whose rôle, partially revealed in his *Dix Mois de ma Vie*, Miss Taffs seems to be unaware).

R. W. SETON-WATSON.

## THE JOURNAL OF MODERN HISTORY

Edited by BERNADOTTE E. SCHMITT and LOUIS GOTTSCHALK

*A Quarterly Review devoted to the History of Europe and its  
Expansion from the Renaissance to the close of the Great War.*

*Contents of the December Issue:*

- THE GENESIS OF THE TOLERATION REFORMS IN BAVARIA  
UNDER MONTGELAS, by Harold C. Vedeler  
THE NOVIBAZAR RAILWAY PROJECT, by Arthur J. May  
DOCUMENTS. EIGHTEENTH-CENTURY RACKETEERING, by  
Constance and Paul Saintonage  
REVIEW ARTICLE BRITISH POLICY IN 1913-14, by R. J.  
Sontag

Reviews

Bibliography

Subscription, 19s. 6d. (post free) a year

PUBLISHED BY

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS

AGENTS IN GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS

200 EUSTON ROAD

LONDON N.W.1.

# FOREIGN AFFAIRS

*An American Quarterly Review*

Hamilton Fish Armstrong—Editor



THE world's leading statesmen, economists and financial authorities write for FOREIGN AFFAIRS. They keep the readers of this important American review informed about the basic causes of the great events which today are making history.

## CONTENTS OF THE JANUARY ISSUE.

ARMISTICE AT MUNICH... ..	<i>Hamilton Fish Armstrong</i>
CZECHS AND GERMANS AFTER MUNICH.... ..	<i>Elizabeth Wiskemann</i>
A TURNING POINT IN HISTORY..... ..	<i>Arnold J. Toynbee</i>
THE WAR IN CHINA CONTINUES .....	<i>Rodney Gilbert</i>
THE NEW BALANCE OF POWER IN THE LEVANT .....	<i>Tomaso Sillani</i>
WHAT FRANCE MEANS TO ENGLAND.... ..	<i>Harold Nicolson</i>
WHAT ENGLAND MEANS TO FRANCE . .....	<i>André Géraud</i>
LATIN AMERICA, GERMANY AND THE HULL PROGRAM .....	<i>Percy W. Bidwell</i>
RACISM IN ITALY... ..	<i>Martin Agronsky</i>
A POLICY OF NEUTRALITY FOR CANADA.. ...	<i>F. R. Scott</i>
SIAM, THE INCREDIBLE KINGDOM.....	<i>John Gunther</i>
AGRARIAN UNREST IN JAPAN.....	<i>W. Ladejinsky</i>
RECENT BOOKS ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS	<i>Robert Gale Woolbert</i>
SOURCE MATERIAL.....	<i>Denys P. Myers</i>

—also the usual maps and notes, bibliography of new books in the international field, index of treaties and trade agreements, etc.

Subscriptions: \$5 a year post free to any address.

Use form below for special offer.

TEAR OFF HERE

FOREIGN AFFAIRS, 45 East 65th St., New York.

Please enter me for a year's subscription and include, without charge, the issue described above. I enclose \$5 in payment.

Name .....

Street .....

City ..... January.

# THE SLAVONIC AND EAST EUROPEAN REVIEW

VOL. XVII. No. 51

April, 1939

---

## AFTER MUNICH \*

*Translated from the Czech by WALTER MORISON*

Heavily,  
words struggle to our lips, dried up with anger.  
Heavily,  
our eyes look round on our diminished homeland.

Care,  
garbed in mourning, moves about among us  
tending a bread-crust—Who shall have it first?  
By the sick-room smell it is Autumn.

With eyes fastened on somewhere far away,  
what seek you?  
A faith that perished? Last year's leaves?  
The warmth of nests cast down?

Stabbing the blue, the Castle,  
loftier than it ever was!  
And in our eyes is shame, for those that stripped us  
and from our sorrows patched themselves a peace.

The sources of our streams have gone from us.  
Only our wells are left us,  
and the starry sky.  
And disgust.

\* Written immediately after the Crisis.

# THE DAY BEFORE THE FLOOD IN ST. PETERSBURG, 1824

OLESZKIEWICZ<sup>1</sup>

When winter makes the sky glow cold and clear,  
It turns dark blue ; black spots of frost appear.  
Like those that mark a dead man's frozen face,  
When near a stove is placed the stiffened clay,  
And, drawing warmth, not life, to its embrace,  
It breathes forth only vapours of decay.  
Warm winds began to blow.—Those towers of smoke,  
That airy city of gigantic size,  
That vision of enchantment, thinned and broke,  
10 And fell in ruins from the darkened skies.  
Smoke flowed in rivers through each street and square,

<sup>1</sup> A painter well known in St. Petersburg for his virtues, his deep learning, and his mystic prophecies.—M

Józef Oleszkiewicz was born in 1777 in Żmudź (a province of Lithuania), of poor parents. He studied painting in Paris under David. In 1810 he went to St. Petersburg, where in 1812 he was elected an honorary member of the Academy of Fine Arts. He died there on October 5 (old style), 1830. One of his works is a portrait of Mickiewicz.

The following quotations are from an obituary notice of Oleszkiewicz by Fr. Malewski —

"Endowed with a strong and active intellect, Oleszkiewicz never ceased his efforts to penetrate the mysteries of the universe and to interpret the Word of God. The Bible became the subject of his meditations day and night, to this Book of Books he related that past and the future history of the world and of man. No one held more dear the word *neighbour*; no one was stirred by it to so prompt and sincere sympathy. His handsome figure, his noble features, his serene brow, and his pleasant voice made it possible for him to banish despair from an afflicted heart and to give consolation."

Another author, Mikołaj Malinowski, writes of him —

"Józef Oleszkiewicz was a theosophist, almost a prophet, to whom Mickiewicz became deeply attached and whom he admired profoundly, maintaining that he should not regard himself as a poet until he had a hundredth part of the inspiration possessed by Oleszkiewicz. And indeed Oleszkiewicz had a powerful imagination, a wonderfully kind heart, huge industry, and fascinating eloquence, marred, however, by a thin, effeminate voice, which in moments of excitement became strident. Absorbed in mysticism, he would have extraordinary visions by broad daylight. . . . He did not hesitate to maintain that the Book of Books tells of all that was, is, and is to be. He believed this so fervently that from prophetic texts he would foretell for long years to come the fate of nations, especially of his own. He was the author of the idea, developed later by Mickiewicz, Krasinski and Odyniec, that the Polish nation had received from God a special, sacred mission to guide humanity along the paths of God."

- Mixed with warm vapours in the close, damp air ;  
 Before night fell, the snow's relentless thaw  
 Had buried pavements neath a Stygian flood.  
 Sleighs fled away, and carriage and landau  
 Cast off their runners , wheels splashed through the mud.  
 But in the humid, smoke-filled, murky night  
 The carriages and cabs are lost to sight ;  
 Only their lanterns wander to and fro,  
 20 Like flames that over marshlands dance and glow.  
 At dusk our youthful travellers walked beside  
 The Neva's shore. They choose the eventide,  
 For thus they shun the stern official eye,  
 And in the empty street will meet no spy  
 Engaged in foreign chat they strolled along ,  
 At times they gently hummed some foreign song .  
 Then they would pause and look around for fear  
 Some one was listening. Not a soul was near.  
 Humming, they loitered on the path atop  
 30 The Alp-like quays that to the water drop,  
 Until they halted where a roadway led  
 Down through the granite to the river's bed.  
 And there below they saw a man who bore  
 A lantern, standing on the lonely shore :  
 No spy, for something in the stream he sought ;  
 Nor ferryman—who sails o'er ice by night ?—  
 Nor fisherman, for in his hands was naught  
 Except a sheaf of papers and his light.  
 The lads drew near : he did not glance about ;  
 40 A rope, sunk in the water, he pulled out,  
 Counted the knots, and jotted down a note ;  
 He sought to plumb the far depths of the stream.  
 The ice threw back his ghostly lantern's gleam,  
 Flooding his weird, white ledgers as he wrote.  
 Above the candle's glow his face was bowed,  
 As saffron-tinted as a sunset cloud .  
 A handsome face, noble of cast yet stern.  
 His ledgers with such industry he read  
 That, hearing steps and voices overhead,  
 50 Who it might be he did not seek to learn ;  
 He only seemed to ask, nay, to demand,  
 Strict silence by a movement of his hand.  
 His gesture was so startling and so grim

- That, though the lads stood almost over him,  
 Whispering, gazing, laughing silently,  
 They all grew still and dared not disobey.  
 One looked into his face and cried, " 'Tis he ! "  
 'Tis who?—A Pole, an artist in his day,  
 But now become a sage in occult lore,  
 60 For paint and pencil he employed no more :  
 The Bible and the cabala he read  
 And even talked with spirits, it was said.  
 The painter, rising, closed his mystic text,  
 And mused aloud " Those who survive this night  
 Will see great marvels of Jehovah's might .  
 This is his second test, beware the next !  
 The Lord will shake the fair Assyrian throne ;  
 The Lord will shake the walls of Babylon.  
 Lord, ere the third test come, let me be gone ! "  
 70 He spoke, and left the travellers alone,  
 Climbed slowly upward, carrying his light,  
 And soon behind the wall was lost to sight.  
 None could explain the message that he gave .  
 Some laughed in scorn, but others were amazed ;  
 All cried " How strangely conjurors behave ! "  
 Then for a moment more they stood and gazed,  
 Till, noting how the stormy night had sped,  
 With hasty step each traveller sought his bed.  
 One lad alone dashed up the steps, and ran  
 80 Along the quay. He could not see the man,  
 But merely glimpsed his lantern from afar,  
 A twinkle like a pale and distant star.  
 Although he had not seen the painter's face,  
 Though his friends' comments he had scarcely heard,  
 Yet had the mystic voice, the startling word  
 Thrilled him. Now could his recollection place  
 That voice, heard once before , with all his might  
 He ran on blindly through the stormy night.  
 The lantern, carried swiftly, winked and tossed ;  
 90 Grew smaller, in the misty dark seemed lost,  
 As though it had gone out . it stopped at last  
 In a great square, amid an empty space.  
 To reach his goal, the lad increased his pace.  
 He saw a heap of stones, impressive, vast ;  
 And on one block he saw the painter stand.

- Quite still amid the shades of night he stood :  
 His shoulders wore no cloak , his brow, no hood ;  
 His arm was raised, the lantern in his hand,  
 And from the angle of his light it seemed
- 100 He gazed upon the palace of the Tsar  
 There at the very end one window gleamed  
 And glittered he observed that earthly star,  
 Whispered, as though the heavens to invoke,  
 Then raised his voice, as to himself he spoke  
 " Thou art not sleeping, Tsar ! The night is still :  
 Thy courtiers sleep, but thou seek'st rest in vain.  
 The Lord hath sent his angel once again  
 To warn thee sternly not to flout his will.  
 Yet still the Tsar seeks sleep, his eyes shut tight ,
- 110 And soon deep sleep will come. In days of yore  
 His guardian angel warned him o'er and o'er,  
 With yet more dreadful visions of the night.  
 " For once he was a man, he was not vile ;  
 Slowly he fell into a tyrant's rôle .  
 God's angels left him, and his ageing soul  
 Sank ever deeper under Satan's guile.<sup>2</sup>  
 This last faint urge, with gentle counsel fraught,  
 He thinks a trifling dream, a thing of nought.  
 His pride each day his flatterers will increase
- 120 Till under Satan's heel his crimes shall cease.  
 " These wretched serfs who in their hovels cower,  
 And not the Tsar, will first meet punishment .  
 For lightning, striking a dead element,  
 Smites first the lofty mountain and the tower ;  
 But in the world of men this is reversed :  
 It strikes the lowly and the guiltless first.  
 " Mid quarrels, lust and wine they fall asleep,  
 Poor corpse-like skulls, to waken in the morn !  
 Rest ye, dull beasts, in slumber sunken deep,
- 130 Till the Lord's wrath awake you like the horn  
 Of forest hunter, whose swift sword lays bare  
 A path of slaughter to the wild boar's lair !  
 " I hear—afar— the storm winds raise their heads  
 Like polar monsters, from their icy beds :  
 Already they have spread their cloudy wings ;

<sup>2</sup> The reference is to the shift of Alexander I, after 1818, from a liberal to a reactionary policy, toward Poland as in other matters.

They mount upon the wave, its strength unchained.  
 I hear ! Now the deep ocean, unrestrained,  
 Champs on its icy bit, strikes out, and springs.  
 Now to the skies it arches its moist neck .  
 140 Now ! Still one chain, but one, holds it in check—  
 Soon that will part ! They strike it blow on blow—”  
 He spoke ; then, sensing his lone auditor,  
 Blew out his candle and was seen no more  
 Thus had he gleamed and gone, foreboding woe,  
 Like an ill omen, smiting suddenly,  
 Then passing by—an awesome mystery

*End of the Digression*

*This Digression the Author dedicates to his Russian friends.*

#### TO MY RUSSIAN FRIENDS

Do ye remember me ? When musing traces  
 Friends' deaths, and banishments and baffled schemes,  
 Ye also gather, and your foreign faces  
 Have right of citizenry in my dreams.  
 Where are ye now ? Ryleyev's<sup>1</sup> noble shoulders  
 That once, I clasped, now by the Tsar's decree  
 Hang on the gallows, where his honour moulders ;  
 A curse on folk that murder prophecy !  
 The hand Bestuzhev<sup>2</sup>, that brave knight and poet,  
 10 Stretched out to me, is torn from sword and pen ;  
 On mine-pit toil the Tsar's commands bestow it,  
 Beside a Polish herd in that bleak den.

<sup>1</sup> Kondraty Ryleyev was a talented poet, but is more famous as a leader in the Decembrist conspiracy against the Russian government. He was one of the five conspirators who were hanged for their share in the revolt, on 13 July, 1826

<sup>2</sup> Four brothers of this name took part in the Decembrist movement. Mickiewicz probably refers to Nikolay Bestuzhev (1791-1855), who collaborated with his brother Alexander and with Ryleyev in editing a magazine, *The Polar Star*. For his share in the conspiracy he was condemned to hard labour for life, first in Schlüsselburg, later in the Nerchinsk mines. He was released from forced labour in 1840 and spent the remainder of his days as a colonist at the newly-founded settlement of Selenginsk.



Others, perchance, endure a fate more dire.<sup>3</sup>  
 Some one, perhaps, seduced by gifts of state,  
 Betrays his free soul to the Tsar for hire  
 And bows today on thresholds of the great.

Perchance with venal tongue he lauds the tyrant,  
 And revels in the martyrdom of friends,  
 Smeared with my blood, he curses the conspirant  
 20 And boasts of horrid deeds as worthy ends

If far to northward, from a new, free nation,  
 These sad songs come to you on soaring wing,  
 Above your land of icy desolation  
 They'll herald freedom, as the storks the spring !

Ye'll know my voice ! For while I was in fetters,  
 I duped the despot, crawling like a snake,  
 But shared my thoughts with you, who as abettors  
 Shielded my dovelike frankness, for my sake.

Now to the world I pour this poisoned chalice—  
 30 A bitter tale sucked forth from burning veins;  
 My country's blood and tears compound its malice;  
 Let it corrode—not you, friends, but your chains !

If one of you cry out, his plaint unsteady

<sup>3</sup> Lines 13-20 are probably directed against the greatest of the Russian poets, Pushkin, of whom Mickiewicz became a warm friend during his stay in Russia (1824-29). In his youth Pushkin had liberal enthusiasms and was intimate with many of the future Decembrists. Had he not been in exile in the south of Russia from 1820 to 1824 and on his own estate in the province of Pskov from 1824 to 1826, he might have joined in the conspiracy; in fact, he is credited with telling Nicholas I that if he had been in St. Petersburg on 14 December, 1825, he "should have been in the ranks of the rebels." Pushkin never wholly renounced the ideas of his youth, but he bowed to fate and after 1826 was at least in outward conduct a docile servant of the autocracy; he furthermore had a personal affection for the Tsar. In 1831, prompted by the Polish insurrection, he wrote two bitterly anti-Polish poems, Professor E. J. Simmons in his *Pushkin* (Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1937, p. 343) comments on the matter: "As for his espousing the cause of Russia against Poland, here Pushkin simply followed the dictates of his conviction. He had never made any secret of his patriotism. Yet one can be a liberal and a patriot at the same time."

The Russian poets Zhukovsky and Homyakov also wrote anti-Polish poems on the same occasion. But both of them were conservatives in politics all their lives, neither had any connection with the Decembrist movement. Mickiewicz may have met them in Russia, though Professor Kallenbach in his *Adam Mickiewicz* does not record any such meeting in either case; he certainly was never a friend of either Zhukovsky or Homyakov.

The barking of a dog shall seem to me,  
 Chained up so long that he at last is ready  
 To bite the hand that gives him liberty.

## BALLAD OF MICHAEL THE DRAGON AND KORUN THE KESSEDJIA

*From the Sofia Province, written down by* STEFAN D. SPASOV<sup>1</sup>  
*and translated from the Bulgarian by* M. O'C. WALSH

THIS is a Bulgarian variant of the Serbian ballad of *Nenad and Korun Kapetan* (V. St. Karadžić, *Srpske Narodne Pesme* VI, No. 12, with three variants), although in its treatment of the theme it incorporates typical Bulgarian elements. The most important of these is the child-hero who is stronger than a grown man, very common in the Bulgarian ballads (Sekula Dětentse, Dēte Dukadinche, etc.), and said to be of Finno-Ugric origin. Thus it is well adapted to illustrate both the resemblances between the Bulgarian and the Serbian folk-ballads, and also some of the specific characteristics of the Bulgarian tradition. Perhaps the incident of the "dragon" may partly explain the obscure motive of *The Avenging Serpent* (A. Dozon, *Chants Populaires Bulgares*, No. 38), which Dozon found incomprehensible. The opening lines are reminiscent of *Sick George* (Dozon No. 40). In the Serbian ballad the nine brothers are sons of Jug-Bogdan, which, of course, conflicts with the famous tradition that all the Jugovići fell at Kosovo. Thus the Bulgarian version may have preserved the original names here.

Passing sick my king fell, King Dimitri,  
 Nine full years he lingered thus in sickness :  
 Bedsteads nine were rotted with his sickness,  
 Pillows nine were rotted with his sickness ;  
 Neither died he nor recovered.<sup>2</sup>  
 Asked him then the young Dimitrevitsa .  
 " Woe is thee, my husband, King Dimitri !  
 Since these nine long years thou thus has lain there,  
 Since thou liest and art surely dying,  
 Thou wilt leave behind thee nine young orphans :  
 What to do with them, I pray thee, teach me ! "

<sup>1</sup> *Sbornik za narodni umotvoreniya, nauka i knizhnina* xvi (Sofia, 1900), 147 & ff.

<sup>2</sup> Short lines are occasionally retained as in the original

Answer made to her then King Dimitri :  
" Thou must keep them, dearest, thou must watch them,  
Till upon their feet they stand as heroes :  
Their turn after that will be to guard thee."  
Thus he spoke, and then his soul departed.  
Then the mother kept them, then she watched them,  
Nine full years her sons with care she tended.  
Then the sons desired all nine to marry ,  
So their aged mother took a bridle,  
Bridled she her husband's charger,  
Then herself she donned her husband's raiment,  
And she went forth into nine great cities,  
And therefrom she chose out nine fair daughters ;  
And all nine were just alike in feature,  
And all nine were just alike in figure,  
And all nine with one name had been christened.  
After Lent they were betrothed and married.  
Fasted they until it was Good Friday,  
Strictly they observed the Lenten fasting.  
On Good Friday, when the fast was ended,  
When all folk go forth to take Communion,  
Then, all nine, they saddled nine fair horses,  
Nine fair horses hitched to nine fair wagons :  
To the brides a wagon each allotted,  
And the lads bestrode the nine fair horses ;  
Set out then along the level highways,  
Issued forth across the open country.  
Thus they went, and came to Korun's city.  
There they met the Kessedjia Korun.<sup>3</sup>  
Slew then Korun all the nine fair brothers  
And imprisoned all the nine fair sisters.  
Then he sent back all the nine fair wagons,  
And he sent back all the nine fair horses.  
Watching stood their mother on the wood-block.<sup>4</sup>  
When she saw the nine fair horses coming,  
Saw the horses, but the lads were missing,  
Saw the wagons, but the brides were missing,  
Fainted she, and fell across the wood-block,  
As she tumbled, right away she fainted.  
God strike dead the Kessedjia Korun !

<sup>3</sup> Robber Turkish *keseçi*.

<sup>4</sup> Outside the door, for chopping wood on.

For he gave unto the nine fair sisters,  
Gave them first a piece of snowy linen,  
Bade them bleach it until it was blackened,  
Gave them then a piece of black-dyed linen,  
Bade them bleach it until it was whitened.  
When their aged mother learnt the story,  
Tiny tears she started weeping for them,  
Tears she wept, and prayed for them to heaven.  
And the gracious Lord took pity on her,  
Then the Lord sent down to her an angel,  
With his mouth he breathed into her nostrils,  
Then conceived the mother from his breathing,  
She conceived, and bore a little man-child;  
Christened she her son the Dragon Michael.  
Him his mother tended two days only,  
Two days and a half she watched him,  
Then he stood upon his feet a hero,  
Up he mounted to the lofty attic,  
There were lying nine sharp-cutting sabres,  
There were lying nine good slender rifles.  
Then he went down to the new-built stable :  
All the horses started neighing,  
Praised they God . “ We thank Thee, God in Heaven,  
That thou givest us a master,  
When we had no water and were thirsting,  
When we had no fodder and were hungry,  
When we had no rider and were restless.”  
Then exclaimed at this the dragon Michael :  
“ Tell me, O my mother, old and foolish !  
Why have we here nine good slender rifles,  
Why have we here nine sharp-cutting sabres,  
Why have we nine well-fed horses ?  
Hast thou been engaged in highway-robbing,  
Or didst thou obtain these things by whoring ? ”  
But his mother thereto softly answered :  
“ Listen to me, O thou dragon Michael :  
Since thou askest, truly I shall tell thee,  
Truly tell thee, and without all lying :  
I was not engaged in highway-robbing,  
I did not obtain these things by whoring :  
Thou, my son, didst once have nine fair brothers,  
Brides I found for all thy brothers,

And they all went forth to take Communion ;  
 Forth they went, and came to Korun's city,  
 There they met the Kessedjia Korun,  
 Slew then Korun all thy nine fair brothers,  
 And imprisoned all thy nine fair sisters ,  
 I, a woman, nowise can avenge them " "  
 When he heard her words, the dragon Michael  
 Went and fetched his charger from the stable,  
 Took his light mace with him, and departed,  
 Forth he went, and came to Korun's city ;  
 There he found the daughters bleaching linen<sup>5</sup>.  
 " Greetings to you, O my nine fair sisters ! " "  
 " God preserve thee, brother, unknown hero ! " "  
 " Tell me now, I pray you, nine fair sisters,  
 Tell me this, and give me faithful answer,  
 Tell without all lying what I ask you  
 Where I'll find the Kessedjia Korun ,  
 I would go and challenge him to battle " "  
 But the sisters from their throats made answer :  
 " Do not go there, brother, unknown hero !  
 He can lift up yonder marble boulder,  
 Lift the marble to thy horse's stirrup." "  
 Angry then became the dragon Michael,  
 And he seized himself the marble boulder,  
 To his horse's mane he lightly tossed it  
 When they saw this, then the sisters told him :  
 " If thou takest here the right-hand pathway,  
 Thou must walk along the new-made pavement  
 Till thou comest to the gates of box-wood .  
 On the gateway nine fair heads are hanging,  
 Nine fair heads of our nine heroes.  
 By the gateway towers have been erected,  
 All of human heads the towers constructed :  
 There resides the Kessedjia Korun." "  
 Then the dragon Michael left the sisters ;  
 At his horse's snort the gates flew open.  
 Cried out loudly then the dragon Michael :  
 " Come outside, thou Kessedjia Korun ! " "  
 Answered then the Kessedjia Korun :  
 " Go away from here, thou scalded puppy !

<sup>5</sup> The impossible task referred to above.

Seemingly some puppy yapped up at me,  
 Yapped at me a puppy, seized with madness "  
 Angry then became the dragon Michael,  
 Took his light mace in his hands and raised it,  
 Raised his mace whose weight was ninety okas,  
 Smote with it the Kessedjia Korun,  
 Smote he Korun in his cursed city.  
 Then he tore the arms off from his shoulders.  
 Mounted then the dragon Michael,  
 Up he mounted to the upper chambers :  
 There he gathered all the little children,  
 Then he cast them on a roaring furnace,  
 So that none should live from Korun's city,  
 None should live, nor children be begotten ;  
 And he slew then Korun's aged mother,  
 Spared alone the youthful Korunitsa,  
 Her he spared, and made her be a handmaid.  
 Then he gathered all the nine fair sisters,  
 Led them back into his mother's mansion ;  
 Softly then he said unto his mother :  
 " Here thou hast, O mother, nine fair daughters,  
 Here thou hast the youthful Korunitsa,  
 Korunitsa, who must truly serve thee."  
 Then departed thence the dragon Michael,  
 Went outside into the spacious courtyard  
 Then the Lord above sent down two angels,  
 And the angels seized the dragon Michael,  
 Bore him up into the bright blue heavens :  
 If an angel, he went to the angels,  
 If of God, then God again received him,  
 If a devil, he went to the devil,  
 From a mother born without a father,  
 Born to be of succour to his mother.

## NIGHT SPEAKS IN BUDAPEST

*(Budapest éjszakája szól)*

*Translated from the Hungarian of ANDREW ADY  
 by GODFREY TURTON.*

To Budapest like a great dream I come,  
 And gay you are, my own city of tears.  
 Where'er my fingers grope, weary and numb,

Music, wine, woman at my touch appears.  
To Budapest like a great dream I come.

I am the drunken ragamuffin, Night.  
One city is my own—poor Budapest.  
Sour taste my beer and wine elsewhere; delight  
So flavours here even the bitterest.  
I am the drunken ragamuffin, Night.

With dreams, with Lethe-water I advance,  
And Budapest shouts, revels—and pays dear.  
Moss of forgetfulness grew in Byzance,  
But never such forgetfulness as here.  
With dreams, with Lethe-water I advance.

Here a last carnival is beckoning  
To each; and five, a hundred florins fly  
Unheeded. Here at night each is a king.  
To-morrow we are ruined, or may die.  
Here a last carnival is beckoning.

Here each a death-flame mirrors in his eyes,  
Each has some grief gnawing at him within :  
Bad women, debts, disease, rash enterprise,  
Bad men, a cruel rumour, secret sin.  
Here each a death-flame mirrors in his eyes.

Here merry Death wafts the procession on :  
Theatres, cafés, fiddlers, music, wine,  
Kisses, groans, fevers, all today has won  
Or lost, and all tomorrow may design.  
Here merry Death wafts the procession on.

Fret of day yields to evening and delight,  
And kindling hearts escort me on my way.  
O glorious adventures of the night,  
What rapture to forget all and be gay !  
Fret of day yields to evening and delight.

Tomorrow you may count on my return;  
But dawn's harsh breath already I can smell.  
On, Budapest ! Race headlong on to earn  
The price of one more night. Till then, farewell ;  
Tomorrow you may count on my return.

## BURYGA

*Translated from the Russian of LEONID LEONOV by*  
W. A. MORISON

THERE lived in Spain a Spanish Count And he had two sons, Rudolf and Vanya. Rudolf was ten, and Vanya younger still.

In his middle years the Count had managed to squander all his fortune on a strolling actress, and in his old age he was left with a pea-jacket and an old house, which he couldn't even afford to have done up. It was then that the Count's wife broke her heart and died.

So the Count lived on the ground floor. There at least some furniture was left, while upstairs in the best rooms existence was quite impossible : the roof leaked, there was nothing to warm the place with in winter ; there the Count's ancestors were comfortably installed in portraits, and didn't care a button. The Count himself served as head clerk at the post-office, his children were learning their Spanish letters, and the cook made broth : so they lived.

Now one cold December something unforeseen befell them. This cook of theirs went down to the river to rinse the linen, and came upon a creature with a snout like an elephant's trunk. She came down to the bank, peered about her, and there she saw it : sitting in a snow-drift, shaggy all over, and clearly freezing to death. Little hoofs stuck out from beneath its little shirt, and its nose was ever so long, an unhuman nose, and the creature was rubbing it with its paws.

The cook was a tender-hearted woman ; she clasped her hands and shook her head :

" Just look at you ! Why, you'll freeze ! "

And the creature peered at her from under frowning brows, and shot at her in a deep bass voice :

" Well, what of it ? " <sup>1</sup>

The woman got in quite a flurry, took the creature in her arms, shoved him in under the washing, and set off for home at full speed.

And all the way the creature was trumpeting from underneath the washing :

" 'Tain't a bit of good ! Never heard such nonsense ! You're wasting your time, old woman ! "

She carried him home, sliced him off about a pound of bread, covered him up with her short fur cloak, stood facing him, and gave vent to her amazement :

<sup>1</sup> The creature's language is throughout that of the traditional Russian peasant.



"Where do you come from, sonny, that you look so queer? Like a monkey, and yet like a child, too!"

The creature rumbled:

"We ain't from these parts!"

And seizing a crust of bread, he started to chew, and a little tail peeped out quivering from beneath the fur cloak. His tail was like a little pendant, and his horns two tiny gems.

At that moment the Spanish Count himself came walking into the kitchen, to put on the kettle for tea. When he caught sight of the creature, he at first even jumped back a little, and then turned angrily on the cook:

"What's the meaning of this? Where did you dig up this creature? What's it doing here?"

So the cook started to tell him:

"Just as I was coming down to the river-bank, I saw him sitting in the snow; he'd stretched his legs out, and was freezing to death."

"Humpf!" said the Count, and came a bit closer.

"Why, yes," he said. "His nose is certainly . . . er . . ."

He thought for a while, then took the creature by the nose and gave it a tug.

The creature gave a wriggle, bristled, and barked at the Count:

"You're a fool, lad, so there!"

For these words the Count gave him a clip on the ear; but then smoothed him gently and said:

"That's how it is, eh? So you can talk, too? What's your name, now?"

Ready to oblige, the creature drawled out:

"Bury-ya!"

And when the creature uttered this, the Count gave a great snort and burst out laughing so loud that the dishes started dancing on the dresser, the canary, half-roused from sleep, tumbled from its perch, and the stove-door closed with a bang. And where did it come from, all that laughter? The man was nothing to look at, with his ribs showing through his pea-jacket; yet he laughed and laughed. Then suddenly growing stern, fearing, no doubt, to lose the cook's respect, he shouted at her, pointing to Buryga and going like that with his hand:

"Give him a good washing with carbolic soap, and then rub him down with naphthaline! We'll make a lackey of him yet!"

And the Count went off to bed, forgetting all about tea.

All the evening Buryga went on eating, till the cook's eyes

popped out of her head; and all the evening Rudolf and Vanya argued: Was it a real creature, or just so?

And when it was long past bedtime, when everybody else was fast asleep, and Buryga, lying down, was chewing the last bit of his fourth pound of bread, the Count's children brought the creature a cigar they had sneaked from their papa.

Buryga took the cigar, ate it up without a word, smacked his lips, and said:

"Well, that wasn't bad at all! Come and see me, lads, some time when I'm not snoozing, and I'll tell you things—thus, that and the other."

And then he shook his head, sucked in the air through his nose, as with a pump, and gave a resounding sneeze. Vanya jumped, and shot like an arrow from the kitchen, his brother close on his heels. And Buryga sneezed once more in their wake, yawned, and dozed off.

The kitchen smelt of cabbage-soup, cockroaches and carbolic soap, and Buryga's last thought was:

"Oh, for a plate of cranberries!"

A fine life Buryga had lived in the green freedom of the woods.

There of a morning the sun rises like a caress. It does not scorch the back of your neck, or shove a skein of burning wool in your throat; in the woods it is one of the family. There of a morning the birds pipe in every scale their jolly cherubic hymns; there hurry to the marshy pool the unknown, unheard-of beasts of the forest. Early in the morning the forest sings its song. And above it pass, on and on, the crimson clouds, crowd together, collide: 'tis no ice-break in the sky, but the joys of earth sailing past.

Out from his lair comes the creature Buryga—in the summer he lived in a sort of hole—stumbles, half-asleep, over the fallen branches; creeps, green as he is, through the green bushes; limps over the jellied surface of the quagmires; leaps nimbly between the dead trees, turns head over heels, darts to and fro. Now he sits down in a forest glade, chuckling and frowning, sits and skips, warms his back, dries his fur in the sun, and the sun caresses him with a warm paw. He blinks and squints, purrs a modest little song, pokes out his tongue at the scarlet mushrooms. And these have decked themselves out as for Mass, and are drawn up, fat and thin, in a line. There are six of them altogether, and this makes them happy.

And now it's evening. The sun has hidden itself, and across

the sky crawls the moon, a well-sucked caramel. Time to start the merry pranks of night.

Buryga strides to the old shaggy trunk—there dwell his acquaintances, Hairy and Curly. Hairy was round and furry, the wood-goblin's grandson, as you might say—his mother was a decayed ash-tree; and Curly was striped grey and green, dry and thin like a foot-rule, a crooked branch on legs. He was a great one for pious learning, where the world came from, who was the wood-goblin's superior, why water was wet. As for Hairy, he was mad on playing pranks, always a-giggle. Buryga thought chiefly about cranberries.

When a damp haze covers the pools, and clouds of gnats hum mournfully, there roll from the trees like acorns, crawl up from beneath the ground, jump out of hollow trunks, slip from amidst the meadow-sweet, the creatures of the bog, sprites of every sort, the evil goblins of the woods.

Here they come creeping over the ground, long-legged and dwarfish, imposing and wretched, the able and the lesser fry. Now they settle down on fallen tree-trunks, on great gnarled roots; round the edge of the greensward sticks the wanton, filthy scum; the forest throng chatters in its own way, gets up to different games, while some of them—shameful to relate!—have learnt to strum on home-made balalaikas.

Now the screech-owl begins to grumble, the squirrel stirs in the brushwood; frightened by the bushes in the night, the hare snorts; the bat (the Devil's plaything) flits past. And in the sky the moon hangs motionless, no longer a caramel, but the strange feather of a bird of Paradise. Then with mysterious sweetness the nightingale begins to throb in the heights, and suddenly a cautious creak beyond the marsh is followed by a despairing, deathly shriek: a green-eyed goblin has sprung on a luckless hare. The pinewood re-echoes with groan and rumble.

But scarcely has midnight swept across the sky than all hurry into hiding: the gnats into the decay of the marsh, the goblins—some creep into the earth, some into the water, under the yellow water-roses, while some clutch a branch with iron claw and hang there till next evening after the fashion of a wasps' nest.

And Buryga is already asleep. He has poked his trunk-like nose into last year's rotten leaves, jerks his little legs in his sleep, and from his nose comes whistle and steam, not a single homeless insect or errant beetle will dare to settle down for the night in Buryga's nostril.

A green snore goes through the pine-forest. The bog-roses and buttercups sway sleepily. And from beneath their red peaks the scarlet mushrooms peer gloomily: there are six of them altogether, and no one to see them, and so they feel vexed and can't get to sleep.

In the autumn the wind hung its damp rags out in the sky, wrung them properly, and from them fell to the earth dirty, tedious rain.

Long since the berries of the rowan had lost their crimson, the red-leaved aspens had rustled for the last time. The creatures of the wood read the signs: time for winter sleep

Curly clambered for the winter into the depths of the quagmire, into its green innards, into the warm mud, where the frost's fingers could not reach him; sat there, pondering all winter long on the mystery of God's nature. Hairy settled down in a corner of the den of a bear he knew. But Buryga kept wandering through the forest, waiting to see if the sun would rise again. But the sun did not rise, and in its stead wet clouds trailed across the sky.

Buryga tried to fashion a rainproof cap from a raven's nest, but only succeeded in vexing himself. The rain fell in torrents, and in that raven's nest dwelt black-polled ants. Through the woods he wandered.

But now it was impossible to stray through the forest. On Yerofey's day, at the wedding of the wolves, it was laid down that the goblins should vanish. At that time Grandfather prowled through the woods with an oaken cudgel, filled with melancholy, his hair tousled; if you then crossed his path, he would either beat you to death or else break your backbone.

But Buryga still wandered, snivelling, and asked a stray raven if the sun was nowhere to be found. The raven cawed, but Buryga did not know the raven's language. And even if he had, it wouldn't have helped him!

And when at length he had lost all faith, he crawled into an unoccupied hollow in a tree, and there tossed sleepless all the winter. It stands to reason; the cold of a pine-forest is no kind aunt.

In the spring it had been joyful in the pine-forest. Spring unwound over the snow its crimson ribbons. The forest rejoiced in the sun, the earth in the thawed patches, the soul in the spring.

But there came a time when the wanton tribe could not await such a spring, when bitter grief was their lot. One day the

morning re-echoed with the thudding of axes ; they slapped joyfully with their dove-grey palms, started kissing right and left, and every kiss meant death. And that same morning the saws gnashed their cruel teeth, bit noisily into the wood, sang loud, no tears could silence their fierce song. The forest gave out an iron groan.

The goblins took fright, but what could they do ? You can't find another dwelling in the depths of winter, or rise in revolt against the might of iron. Resign yourselves, present your throats to the jagged teeth, be silent !

Buryga leapt like a green leaf from his hollow, slipped into a hazel-bush, no one spying him, dashed off to Grandfather's lair :

"Grandpa, Grandpa ! They are cutting the forest down ; axes have come !"

Grandfather blinked his hairless brows .

"Axes ? Let them come ! It's all right, my pet. I'll show them ! Just you wait !"

"But what can you show them ? They're coming ! Tomorrow they'll be here !"

"Tomorrow, you say ? It's all right, my precious. This night I'll give them such a fright . . ."

Reassured, Buryga murmured :

"Then I can sit here with you for a while, eh ?"

"Sit, my dear, sit."

That night Grandfather set out to scare the woodcutters. He roared with awful laughter, hooted twice, struck the ground with a rotten aspen-stem to increase the uproar ; crept on all fours towards the place where the trees were being felled. He looked out from behind a hazel-bush, and quaked with fear. Before him the soft forest-sward lay trampled by the wood-cutters' boots ; cheerful fires were blazing, the tired axes lay dozing by them, and the lads were making soup. There were thirteen of them, perched side by side on a birch-trunk, in red shirts, singing ; and their song, mingling with the smoke from the fires, spread over the ground. The birch-tree lay stretched on the earth, lay there like a green forest-banner.

Grandfather stood for a while, blinking. He realised that it was time to go away ; they were lads with shoulders as wide as doorways, any of whom would fell a pine with one blow. He plodded home, and when he saw Buryga he wailed pitifully :

"Run, my pet, where you can ; this is no place for us now. Run !"

Buryga mumbled to himself, and that same night the two went off in different directions. Grandfather went to his nephew, who

served as wood-goblin in a neighbouring pine-forest. In his bag he had a fearsome cardboard mask, just in case, and a passport in the name of one Ivan Stepanov, complete with signatures and the official seal, and guaranteed to stand the closest scrutiny. And he wore an ordinary peasant overcoat.

And Buryga wandered on and on, till he came to a village. This village—Vlasyev Bor—was not large, but in it dwelt kind folk.

In this village dwelt an old midwife whom people called Kutafya. All sorts of things were told of her. She could, it was said, cast an evil spell, dry up a maiden—the bones would come through the skin like down from a feather-bed; she could, folk believed, if she had quarrelled with someone, give him a rupture and a goitre, so that he ceased to be a man and became nought but a legless tavern spigot. But all this was untrue. Kutafya was a good woman, in her hut there hung in the corner of honour an image of the Burning Bush, with a well-trimmed lamp before it; in this corner there was a martyr who would cure you of thirty-three ills, and a phial of Jordan water brought from the Holy Land.

It was to her hut that Buryga wandered, over the first hard snow of winter, crawled into the larder, curled up in a ball, and sat there softly wailing. And as it would happen, Kutafya had occasion to go there. The old woman came in, and stood rooted to the spot. It was as though she had received a splash of cold water down her back. Some sort of furry creature sat there (what it was she couldn't distinguish), squealing and, as it seemed, warming a great axe-haft. The old woman said to it:

"Who are you, you devil? What are you doing in other people's larders? Tut, tut! Thinking to rob a poor old woman, eh?"

Buryga replied, with teeth that chattered:

"I came here," said he, "to die, old woman."

The old woman saw it was no thief, but a good creature.

"But who are you, then? What do you do for a living?"

"I? Why, nothing! I'm from over yonder, from the forest . . . A forest-creature . . ."

The old woman was perplexed.

"Well, now!—See here, I haven't time to stand gossiping with you; come into the hut, and we'll see how things stand."

And so they did. The old woman gave him a good wash in the tub, so that he should not make a mess of the hut; gave him her dead husband's felt boots, her husband's peaked cap that looked like a wash-stand. Buryga started to live at the old woman's,

sleeping on the raised platform, and became in a word just like any other villager.

If Kutafya fell ill, he would go into the garden for logs in winter, fetch water, even sneak a fowl from next door for the sick woman. And people never thought of asking who this lad was who'd suddenly turned up. Everyone thought it was her bewitched grandson.

Buryga quite fell in with the life at Vlasyev Bor, and now and then of an evening he would even look in at the village gatherings. He would come in, stand in a corner away from the lads, peer around him from under his brows. The girls all took him for a loony, and went into fits of laughter at the sight of him: to laugh at a loony is no sin, you know; it helps to save his soul. And one of the girls, Lenka, was a regular tease:

"Come on, Buryga," she would say, "you be my wife! Ha! I'll steam you well in the bath-house, put you in my bed, and oh! how I'll love you!"

Buryga would grunt to himself, scan Lenka from head to foot—she was a stout-hipped lass who made the lads' mouths water—and trumpet gloomily:

"It's lying you are. You won't love me, not for anything."

And Lenka would tease Buryga more than ever, looking him straight in the eyes:

"It's true. I simply can't imagine how I could take you to wife. 'Twouldn't be possible to kiss you even, you'd poke my eyes out with your great snout."

Buryga just snorted. . . .

This is what happened next:

At Shrove-tide there came to the village of Vlasyev Bor a swell—flapping trousers, a watch-chain and boots, a stick in his hand, fat, from the city. He had come, you must know, on business, to do a deal in timber with Semyon Gırın; and, as it would happen, Buryga was just going along to fetch water. The gentleman saw him, took in the position at a glance, hurried into Kutafya's hut, stuck to her like a bath-broom leaf; urged the old woman, breathing beerily into her face:

"What is he, your grandson?"

"My grandson, good sir, my grandson."

"You're lying, old woman. This is no human. Sell him to me, old woman! I'm a kind man, and he'll have a good time with me. I'll feed him with sausage, teach him to ride a bicycle, and show him

to people at twenty copecks a time. Sell him, old woman ! I don't mind if you ask a thousand roubles ! ”

The old woman hummed and hawed. She'd miss him ; and yet, after all, he'd be off in the summer. The gentleman looked important and you can't pick up a thousand roubles every day. And we might add that she had long been wanting a gown for holidays, brown and rustling.

“ Very well,” she said, “ take him. You're not a heathen, and you'll give him food and drink. But a thousand roubles is not over-much, sonny, have pity on an old woman, and give me three more.”

The gentleman was immensely tickled. The golden chain danced on his chest, and his stomach threatened to burst out from under his waistcoat. He got out his purse, counted out a hundred roubles in copecks, since the old woman knew no better ; from pure kindness added three roubles more, and fifty copecks for her compliancy.

Kutafya beamed all over, and helped the gentleman to put Buryga in his bag. Buryga resisted, and made to bite the gentleman's mitten. The gentleman snarled :

“ Just wait, you devil ! ”

He gave Buryga a dig in the ribs, and Buryga calmed down. It doesn't take much to subdue an orphan wood-sprite.

The gentleman shoved into the bag a crust of bread, so that the creature should not die of hunger : a hundred and three roubles and fifty copecks is no sum to be rashly expended ; tossed the bag into his sleigh, neighed like a stallion with laughter, and drove off. He didn't even stop at the timber-merchant's ; for some reason he was in a hurry.

For many a day after that Kutafya grieved to think that she had charged the gentleman nothing extra for the old woollen jacket Buryga wore.

At the railway station the gentleman took Buryga out of the bag and put him into a travelling-trunk, gave him some more bread, locked up the trunk, and settled down to sleep in the upper bunk.

All the journey he snored fiercely. He would sleep a while, wake up, put his hand in the trunk, tweak the sleeping Buryga by the nose, or else give him a clip with his great finger-nail, for his own enjoyment, and give him a toffee.

It was stuffy in the trunk, but that wasn't the worst of it. A cut-glass bottle thrust its iron head straight into Buryga's stomach, and seemed to want to pierce him through and through. But Buryga puffed up his stomach, and the bottle reluctantly moved to



one side. Then the brush that was at Buryga's head went frantic, and plunged all its delicate teeth, like bradawls, into Buryga's neck.

Buryga defended himself with his teeth as best he could, snivelled quietly, and chewed away at his bread.

The gentleman got down from his cab at a large wooden shack with a weather-beaten signboard, and looked sternly at the cabman. The cabman blinked his reddish eyebrows guiltily, scratched his nag's back shamefacedly with his whip-handle, and suddenly fired out :

"Twenty copecks!"

The gentleman silently handed him a false twenty-five copeck piece, and went importantly in at the doorway. The man sitting at the desk closed himself twice like a clasp-knife, and was motionless in frozen reverence. The gentleman banged his trunk on the counter—the bottle and the brush at once fell on Buryga!—and articulated distinctly :

"I want a room at about eighty copecks."

The clasp-knife thrust forward a grubby great ledger, hissing :

"Sign, please, sir. . . . Surname and Christian names. . . . So!"

The gentleman signed with a flourish :

"Heinrich Butterbrot."

The clasp-knife hissed again, sprinkling spittle :

"This way, please. Number six."

Heinrich Butterbrot threw back a request as he moved off :

"Send along a samovar and a basin."

And added hurriedly, as though justifying himself :

"I shall have a cup of tea. Send along some cutlets, too; you know, none of your . . ."

And he went into his room. There he at once unpacked Buryga, poured hot water from the samovar into the basin, squinted pensively at the bunched-up Buryga, and said gloomily :

"I just don't happen to have any soap. Never mind, I'll give you a good rub down with the brush!"

At these words Buryga's fur rose. But the gentleman, wasting no time, thrust him into the hot water and started to rub him with the hair-brush.

The brush swept triumphantly over Buryga's body, sprang unexpectedly from his leg to his neck, and there left a vicious trace. Off Buryga flowed the familiar green. And the gentleman, puffing, scraped away at his little hooves with various sharp instruments, snorted loudly, now and then uttered a word of consolation :

"Never mind, little devil; have patience! We'll make you look like a human being yet!"

But that was just what Buryga didn't want to look like! He was on the point of losing his temper; but now Butterbrot completed his labours, took a sheet from the bed, and rubbed Buryga till he was quite dry. Then Buryga's fur clung to his body, his knees bent with shudders, his little tail dropped despondently. The gentleman left him to himself, set about the cutlets, ate them, opening wide his toothless jaws—he had only four teeth, and those in front, for show. Then he gave Buryga some more bread.

When evening came, Butterbrot sprinkled Buryga with eau-de-Cologne, locked him up in the trunk, and drove him to the circus. Kutafya's woollen jacket he gave to the clasp-knife at the desk:

"Sell it to the old-clothes man, and keep the proceeds. In our days," said he, "even a rouble is not to be sneezed at!"

Now the fat was in the fire: Buryga had become a human being. His portrait had been painted on leaflets, and he walked about in a frock-coat, his hair cropped like a Frenchman's.

Now he was in a pretty pickle: on grey dull mornings, when longing for the forest stirred in the creature's breast, he stole from Butterbrot cognac by the glassful.

But Butterbrot had grown rich; put gold teeth in his jaws, and could have put diamond ones there, but the dentist advised him not to: "Unpractical," he said. He bought a carriage that went by itself, and a lad in a fur coat to work it; he bought a top hat. Butterbrot had grown rich, collecting twenty copecks per person for the exposure of Buryga's shame.

Shame it was! Of a morning his master would turn him this way and that, till the creature came out in a green sweat; and in the evening he crept without being bid into the trunk and locked himself in with the key.

At the circus Boris Isakych Meyer himself led Buryga, together with the red-headed clown Osip Ivanovich, out into the ring; there they were received by a well-built lad with the face of a torturer. Nimble and indifferently he tossed Buryga towards the roof, on to the trapeze, and at the same time thrust into Osip Ivanovich's nose a pinch of white powder that made the eyes water and the nose itch terribly. Buryga contorted himself up in the air, and Osip Ivanovich went skipping round the ring, emitting agonising sneezes to the thunderous applause of the public.

They sometimes threw Buryga sweets and apples, which Butter-

The merchant's widow reared up :

" No, no ! Do what I ask, good sir ! I will teach him all the sciences, send him out into the world like a man, do a good deed for the repose of my husband's soul ! "

Butterbrot pulled a face. In his heart of hearts he wasn't at all disinclined to get rid of Buryga. The creature did cause him quite a lot of trouble first scientists would come, measure Buryga's head, look at him through a telescope ; then newspapermen would come in droves, cling like leeches to him with their questions. " But can he talk French ? But can he eat nails ? " Awful !

Butterbrot snapped out :

" A million ! "

And then he champed, and added hastily, fearing the woman might go off in a huff :

" But from you I ask a mere five thousand. Let me have something on account, and I'll wrap him up and send him along. "

The merchant's widow at once planked down the whole sum :

" Yours the goods, " said she, " and mine the money. Take this in full settlement ! "

Butterbrot stowed the bills away in different pockets, put on his top-hat, and went off to squander the money on drink.

And in the woman's hands Buryga quite recovered.

You can't wander about in foreign parts for ever ; the time comes when home calls. The merchant's widow went back to Spain. Here she had a number of unpleasant experiences. Firstly, Buryga had no sort of passport, and the woman did not feel inclined to pass him off as her son people would laugh at her. She had to pay a stiff import duty on Buryga as an article of foreign production. And secondly . . . But there was no secondly that's all there was to it.

Buryga travelled in a warm box, wrapped up in a blanket which the woman had taken from the hotel. that is an old Spanish custom.

They travelled and travelled, and at last their travels were over.

In the widow's house Buryga took third place. First came the lap-dog Annette—she had human eyes, and could walk on her hind legs. Second came Zosima the parrot, whom the deceased merchant had taught in his spare time to use indecent expressions. And third came Buryga.

Commons were rather short at the woman's house. In the morning a maid would bring to the green velvet cushion on which

Buryga was convalescing a tiny cup of coffee and a wafer for the repose of the merchant's soul. Buryga would swallow this in a trice, and at once set out in search of something to eat. He stole beans from Zosima the parrot, drank the oil from the holy lamps—the merchant's widow had quite a hundred of them hanging about the place; chewed the woman's felt boots under the sofa, and once pinched from the kitchen three and a half pounds of washing-soap. Give Buryga what you liked, and he'd eat it all, and all was too little.

But as soon as he had had something to eat, his deadly torments began. The widow set about teaching him different sciences—arithmetic, geography, Scripture, and other divine subjects, at which the skin wrinkled on his forehead from fatigue, and his devil's soul cockled despondently.

And Buryga thought—

“How Curly loved divine things; yet even he would run away from this! That he would!”

One bright day at the beginning of December—in Spain the frost nips even on Sundays!—the widow came to give him his lesson in a pink dressing-gown. Her hair, tamed with olive-oil, lay smooth in little paths, and on the nape was twisted so tightly that the oil threatened to ooze out any minute.

That day the widow's soul was filled with gladness: the chief Spanish bishop had promised to visit her. Two days before, he had questioned her about Buryga at Mass, and thus expressed himself: “I have heard much about your (pardon the term) creature. It is imperative, you know, that we should convert him to the Spanish faith, and then set him loose in the forest—there let him spread our faith.” And the widow was overjoyed, and her heart leapt with gladness.

So she came to Buryga, sat on a chair, and began to hear his prayers. Buryga recited to her the Spanish *Ave*, told her about the Spanish miracle-worker who walked on the surface of the sea; told it well, and the widow could not refrain from smoothing the fur on his head. She smoothed him—and felt his little horns! Then the dough under the parchment turned blue, her hair sprang from the bonds of the olive-oil, and from her throat shot such a crazy squeak that Buryga felt quite queer. He frowned at the widow, and his demon heart could not refrain—the cursed one swung his fist, struck the widow in the face once, twice; wanting to stop, but had so got going that he struck her yet a third time.

The widow wailed like an unoiled door; her wretched lap-dog

yelped and snapped at Buryga's leg. A commotion arose. And while they were pouring spirits of hartshorn down the swooning woman's throat Buryga escaped from her house, just as he was, in his little shirt.

He ran yelling ten versts or so. His hooves sank in the snow, his snout swung to and fro, and finally his strength failed him: he fell half-dead in a snow-drift by the river. There he was found by the Count's cook.

And that same day the widow celebrated two consecrations of the water on the occasion of her delivery from the devil.

What a business! He-he!

The Count was preparing for his name-day. Which his Saint was, I don't know, I haven't consulted the Spanish calendar. I only know that it was in the winter.

A week in advance the Count started to get ready. They baked a pie as big as a house, bought a whole basket of sausages; the Count himself, with his sleeves rolled up, sliced apples, made liquors of different herbs, and kept sampling them. From these tests he had a shaking in the legs right up to his name-day, and a commotion in the head.

And for Buryga they had sewn a jacket with bright buttons and ordered a sort of wig, and his legs they had encased in stockings. Buryga became just like an officer, but of the comic variety.

And at length the day arrived. The Count's uncle came, a hairless old man, Ivan Sergeyich by name, the Spanish bishop came in his epaulets; the merchant's widow came, for she was the Count's neighbour; a deaf lady came, bringing her whole tribe with her: two daughters like tubs, and the third a dry dark stick in a white frock. And others came as well.

And did they have a good time! The guests lolled on sofas, drinking liquors and nibbling sausage, chewed lemons as though they were turnips. The Count himself skipped across the floor in a crouching position, handing out cognac to his guests by the bottle, his head in a whirl with gladness.

The Count had a secret in his heart: he wanted to surprise his guests, to show them as a final treat the creature with the snout like a trunk. And when the time came—the guests were bawling songs, the bishop drifted about among the tables—the Count equipped Buryga with a tray, put bottles on it, let him through the door right into their midst. With his snout rubbing the tray went Buryga.

He went right into the middle of the room; and when he caught sight of the merchant's widow, the tray crashed to the floor. On the floor spread a sea of wine sprinkled with islands of glass.

The merchant's widow, half-asleep as she was, did not realise what had caused the crash—she hadn't a good head for wine. But the Count was furious, dragged Buryga behind the door, and there gave him a thundering box on the ear and kicked him into the bargain.

Buryga was never quite the same again.

He lay in the kitchen under the bed, covered with a mat, the creature with the snout like a trunk. He lay and snorted, sparks hissed in his inside, tar was boiling in his head, threads were being pulled from his legs: the Count had broken his main sinew. The cook gave him a cucumber-pickle to drink; but pickle is only good for bruises, and does not mend a break.

Buryga lay there, and a heavy smell spread from him through the kitchen. It was dull lying so. Now and then he would crawl to the middle of the room, where it was sunny. That was asking for trouble: the Count came noiselessly into the kitchen—he had rubbers on his shoes—came in, and caught sight of Buryga.

The Spanish Count let out a yell, his ribs clattered—his ribs were like that—and he started to give the cook orders:

“Throw him out at the gate; let them pick him up there! Or rather, throw him into the neighbour's well first thing in the morning! Don't fail!”

For the Count was on bad terms with his neighbour.

He yelled himself hoarse and went out, slamming the door.

The cook felt like weeping, but a bright idea occurred to her: she carried Buryga into Sharik's kennel. However much she wished, the woman dared not disobey the Count's orders.

Sharik was the watchdog, an old cur with grey whiskers. Sharik was the cook's best friend. And Buryga was put in with him.

And he got quite friendly with Sharik, and they shared their bones, and slept together, just like brothers.

Winter was not yet over.

Once—in Spain February is a very different month from the February we know!—one night was quite clear. The two shaggy ones had slept all day in the kennel, warming one another. And when night came they crawled out into the yard.

The moon was in the sky, the stars were creeping towards its

edges; it was deep night. The two shaggy ones sat for a while on the snow, howled at the moon in unison, and then went home again; lay down, covered themselves with old rags—God bless the cook!

Buryga gave a sigh, and began to tell Sharik of his wanderings, thus:

“We lived in the woods. In the place where the sun comes from. I lived there, and Hairy, and with us another—Curly was his name. And in that pine-forest there lived a strict old man, Sergey; he feared God, and loved all the creatures of the earth.

“Once in the winter—there the winters are not as they are here: there in the morning the sun freezes to the edge of the earth and cannot rise; darkness all day long!—once that winter we had nowhere to go, there wasn’t a single warm spot to be found; so we crept into an old man’s stove-pipe, and there we lived. The old man knew of this, and was silent. And at times he would leave for us on the hearth, as though by chance, now a crust of bread, now some cabbage-soup in a saucer; and so we managed.

“But one day a mad fancy entered Hairy’s head: to sprinkle some snuff to make the old man sneeze. And we, too, were quite willing for some fun. Now the old man, you must know, was merciful to fleas, but himself he tortured every night one way or another.

“And so—where he got it from, I don’t know—but Hairy sprinkled some snuff in the old man’s cassock. We sat there in the pipe and waited. And Hairy kept tickling my nostrils with his tail, so that I was bursting with laughter.

“Suddenly we heard sneezing, and an angry cry:

“‘You,’ says he, ‘Hairy, shall burn like a golden flower on St. John’s day!’

“‘You,’ says he, ‘Curly, shall be beaten to death by Grandfather on Yerofey’s day!’

“‘And you,’—thus he said to me—‘Buryga, shall lie dying in foreign parts from the blow of a heathen hand; not quite dying, but giving out a smell.’”

“That’s how it happened. I have no friends now. Just me, and you with me.”

Sharik heaved a deep sigh: the soul in him—yes, yes, God’s spirit rests on Sharik!—his soul was a kindly soul.

Sharik thought his thoughts, Buryga his. It was warm in the kennel with all that fur.

And beyond the kennel went the pale moon, blue night hung, stars in the sky; you felt like howling . . .

March had come in from the country about a week since, and it was the same sort of night

Buryga lay there; time passed Suddenly he turned to Sharik and spoke to him, and as he spoke the heart sank in him:

"Sharik, Sharik, I say!"

"Well, what is it?"

But Buryga was silent Then again:

"Sharik!"

"Well?"

"Sharik, I want to go back home . . . to the forest . . ."

A lump came into Sharik's throat:

"What d'you want to do that for?"

"It's all wrong in these parts. Things are different our way. It's not for you to understand, Sharik I shall go there on foot."

They were silent again.

In the sky is a blue ship. In that ship sail unknown dreams; over the earth bloom blue flowers of snow . . . Who was it sowed you?

Again Sharik spoke:

"Well, run along, then . . . It stands to reason . . ."

And he turned his back on Buryga. He turned his back because he didn't want anyone to see his doggy tears. His ears quivered.

Buryga asked:

"What's come over you, Sharik?"

Sharik whined roughly:

"It's just . . . that I'm getting old . . . ,"

But sorrow had set his fur on end. And he added:

"Well, run along . . ."

That night they howled at the moon for the last time together. After that there were no more moons: damp, low clouds crept stealthily across the sky, keeping watch for the spring sun.

And one day he packed his traps.

March was nearly over. Buryga had some bones wrapped in a rag, a bit of bread as well; and on his back an old quilted jacket, a gift from the cook.

The cook stood for a while in the porch, looking at the accursed one, and whispered piteously, like a prayer:

"Well, be off with you! I'm quite frozen, standing about! And take care you don't fall under a train! Oh, you awkward creature!"

And she went inside.



Buryga sat down by Sharik, who licked his trunk-like snout and once more turned his back : dogs' eyes cannot hold the tears

Buryga went out through the gate.

And again night was in the sky. It whispered prayerfully down :

" Run along, Buryga, run along ! When needful I will wrap you in darkness, when needful I will bear you on my wings Run along ! "

That night till morning Sharik howled in the courtyard He howled by himself, stretching to the sky his round foolish hairy jaws. Howled and howled, not letting the Count get to sleep, not letting silence wrap the earth in dreams . . .

It's natural A dog's grief is not a pound of raisins !

## A SEA CHANGE

*Translated from the Roumanian of I A. BRĂTESCU VOINEȘTI*  
by W. A. MORISON

" LINA," says the master, handing the maid-servant a five-lei piece " I rang for you. Take this, and run along to the tobacconist's D'you know where the tobacconist's is ? "

Lina ponders. She's not too sure. The master explains :

" In the market Opposite that big coffee-house."

Lina then remembers, and goes " Aha ! "

" Run along there, and buy me a packet of *Intim-Club* cigars *In-tim-club.*"

And since Lina came from the country only three days ago, the master asks her

" Will you remember, or shall I write it down ? "

But Lina wishes to prove to the master that she's a bright girl. She won't have him write it down :

" Of course I shall remember. I shall keep saying to myself : *intinclud.*"

And she goes into the servants' room to put on her kerchief, for it doesn't do to go to the market bare-headed. While she is busy at the mirror, she feels sorry that she did not pluck up enough courage to ask the mistress to advance her six lei out of her wages, so that she could buy a pair of shoes. . . Tomorrow morning she mustn't fail to ask. . . Bare feet look bad. . . All the men quiz. . . Six lei is not a fortune. . .

And Lina sets out, repeating all the way to the gate :

*"Intinplug . . . intinplug . . . intinplug . . ."*

When she opens the gate, she perceives a blond horse that for two days or so has been walking by itself, untended, up and down the street. Yesterday, the gate being open, it marched into the garden, and the master was ever so cross because it trampled down a few flowers.

"Whoever can it belong to?" wonders Lina, gazing right and left; and, not seeing anyone, she picks up a stone and drives it away. "Shoo, nag! May the wolves devour you!" Then, when the horse has made off, she turns round and sets out for the market, pronouncing carefully, so as not to forget.

*"Itimplu . . . itimplu . . . itimplu . . ."*

At the corner of the street, at Mihăescu's, some masons are working at the wall of the house. One of them, seeing her go by, says politely, winking at his mates

"Hey, Miss, your shoe's come undone!"

One must believe that Lina would have preferred a slap in the face to this pleasantry, which scorches her heart. Thus is explained the violence of her answer, only the conclusion of which can be set down here. "May God give you sunstroke, rogue that you are!" But, remembering the master's cigars, while the masons are splitting their sides, Lina hurries on, saying over and over to herself:

*"Iplintiu . . . iplintiu . . . iplintiu . . ."*

While she is passing Taşcu's inn, without warning there shoots out at full speed from the passage-way a cart driven by a young lad. By a miracle Lina manages not to be run over, while the lad yells:

"Blind devil!"

Is not Lina justified in feeling indignant? How was she to see through the wall that he was coming out of the passage-way? Is that how you come out of a passage? At full speed?

"May God and His Holy Mother strike you with lightning!" says she in conclusion, and goes her way, explaining to a woman how she was very nearly killed.

The woman relates that the same thing, exactly the same thing, happened to her last week, "all because of that wretched lad"; that in her fright she dropped a bottle that smashed to bits; that one day he nearly killed Joseph the tinsmith's missus. . . ."

And here's the tobacconist's. Lina, who all the time the woman has been telling her own misadventure, and that of Joseph the tinsmith's wife, has not ceased repeating religiously to herself the

name of the cigars, walks confidently in, presents the five-lei piece, and says clearly and distinctly :

" Give me a packet of *iflingiu* tobacco "

" Of what ? " asks the tobacconist, bending his ear over the counter.

Lina, seeing that he is old, thinks he is deaf, and yells at him .

" *Iflingiu* tobacco "

The tobacconist scrutinises her Can she have been taken queer ?

Then he presses the coin into her palm

" We don't keep it."

But Lina persists, and thinking that he still hasn't understood, roars at him, syllable by syllable :

" *I-flin-giu* tobacco !"

The tobacconist, losing patience, roars back

" Didn't you hear me say that we don't stock it ? Be off with you ! What d'you mean, yelling like that ? "

Lina hurries home by another route, so as not to encounter the masons. Reaching the master's room, she hands him the money, saying with an accent of deep regret :

" They've got none."

" How d'you mean, got none ? " asks the master in surprise. " What did you ask for ? "

" What you told me to *aflangiu* ! "

## THE OTHER WORLD

*Translated from the Bulgarian of " ELIN-PELIN " by*

M. LAWTHER.

WHEN the news spread through the village that old Granfer Matthew was dead, nobody believed that it was true, for he was well known as a joker, and up till then nothing of the sort had happened to him. But when old Mother Yova described his last moments, everyone was convinced that this time he was not joking. The old man had returned from the wood, unloaded his little ass, tied him up, put him out a little hay; and no sooner had he entered his hut, and sat down by the fire to light his pipe, than something cut him right across his middle; he lay down, gave a groan, and . . .

Neighbours gathered round, old Mother Yova went too. Wasn't the poor fellow all alone, he and his gentle little donkey, grey as a dove, humble and obedient as a nun? Old Mother

Yova went, to see if his spirit had already departed and forestalled her. "I just called out to him," she related, "that he should cross himself; and it looked as if he made an effort, but could not move. They brought him a gift of a little flask of gin. He took it and smiled, his eyes lit up, and . . . he passed away."

He died with a smile on his lips. Whether it was because his soul at that moment entered Paradise, or at the sight of the gin, no one can say.

When poor old Granfer Matthew set out for the other world, he first of all stopped at a cross-roads where there were many travellers such as he.

"Well met!" he greeted them, and without stopping to think added: "Hey, brothers, which road leads to Hell?"

Everyone looked at him in astonishment.

"To Hell, to Hell; which way leads there?" repeated Granfer Matthew in a loud voice.

They pointed it out to him, and he straightway started off along it.

"That's certainly where they'll put me," he thought; "just give me time to get there! I'm not for Paradise, a poor old fellow like me. Paradise is meant for fine folk. With these old rags and these worn hands, who would let me in there? For eighty years I have toiled and laboured; why should I expect to live at ease now? It's true I tried to live according to God's commandments, but even so . . . God won't sit down and judge folk like me. We were entered in the Devil's register the moment we were born. And if I have done right in some things, I have sinned at least in drinking. How I used to drink! Again and again, when things were going wrong, I used to think: Drink! Drink, for what else can I do? Well, I paved my way to Hell. And now I'm going there. If a man's to drown, at least let him drown deep!"

These thoughts had carried Granfer Matthew a long way on his journey. But suddenly an angel pulled him back by his fur coat.

"Stop, my good fellow! Where are you going?"

"Why, to Hell, of course," replied the old man.

"To Hell? You've mistaken your road, Granfer!"

"No, I've not mistaken it; I'm going in the right direction, depend upon it! I know who goes where; don't think I'm so foolish as I look!"

" But you're put down for Paradise! "

" My dear lad, I've started on my road; don't mock at an old fellow, it's shameful! "

The angel, when he saw that he could do nothing by persuasion, clasped the old man in his arms and flew high towards the bright expanse of Heaven, where it smelt of wonderful Smyrna incense, and where flew about flocks of bright angels with sweet basil in their hands, singing in a manner which quite carried one away: " Holy, Holy, Holy, Lord God of Sabaoth! "

" Where are you carrying me, lad? The great folk there will scold you; don't you see how I smell of gin? " cried Granfer Matthew, and tried to escape. But the angel only flew more swiftly, and carried him higher and higher into the brighter regions, till they reached the gates of Paradise. These were made of gold and precious stones, and shone like the bright sun. In front of them Saint Peter was waiting with a silver key in his hand and a great register under his arm.

" From what village? " he demanded of Granfer Matthew, and began to fumble in the register. Granfer Matthew couldn't move. Making an effort, he at last opened his mouth:

" Why, I'm from Poduene . . . "

" From Po . . . ? "

" From Poduene! " Granfer Matthew loudly shouted, for he thought Saint Peter must be hard of hearing.

" Po . . . Po . . . Po . . . , " Saint Peter began turning the leaves of the register, " Poduene . . . Good! he's reckoned among the saints! "

" It can't be! You're making a mistake, Saint Peter! "

" How do you mean, a mistake? This is no cabbage-pie but a register, numbered, bound and sealed by God's hand, " argued Saint Peter.

" All right; let's hope you won't repent later! " replied Granfer Matthew.

" Why? "

" Because when I was a man I used to drink a lot, so I don't believe I'm reckoned among the saints. "

" You drank much, but you suffered much, and so it is forgiven you, " answered Saint Peter, and opened the gate for him.

" Well, well, Saint Peter, if only I had brought my little ass with me . . . " Granfer Matthew began, but the angel pushed

him into Paradise, and he was struck so dumb with astonishment he could not finish expressing his thought.

Immediately Granfer Matthew entered Paradise, he remembered his old woman, who had left this sinful earth a long time before him.

"If they let me in at the gate, who used to drink and beat her, they must have put her right in the middle. She was milder than a lady-bird, and forgave everything . . . How should I have got on without her? "

And he turned to a little angel.

"Hey, butterfly, have you got a certain old Grandmother Matthew here, Trena by name? "

"From what village? " asked the little angel.

"From Poduene."

"That we have," said the little angel, and led the old man through Paradise.

"What beautiful, what wonderful things!" marvelled Granfer Matthew, as he gazed on the glories of Paradise, which none but the just shall see.

"And is Father Nicholas here too? " he began enquiring of the tiny angel.

"Who? "

"Father Nicholas from the little church, who used to lend us money at interest . . . I am ashamed to meet him. There was something I owed him; but he died, so my debt died too."

"Father Nicholas is in boiling pitch, Granfer."

"You don't say so! "

"On my word of honour! "

"But he was a priest, a man of God! "

"That doesn't matter . . . All men are equal here . . . Everyone according to his deeds. He was a priest, but he sinned. A priest may be a priest, but he, too, can go to Hell."

"Well, well, well! "

"And he is receiving his punishment, Granfer . . . He was a servant of the Church, it is true; but he was eaten up with pride of office, considered only fine folk to be human beings, and for poor people he could not spare a glance, despised them; and if he gave them alms, gave disdainfully, looking only for a second and then turning away. He dressed richly and ate his fill every day, but told the poor to be abstemious . . . Isn't that a sin? "

Granfer Matthew rubbed his forehead with his hand, and said :

" How do I know whether it is a sin or not? We are too stupid to understand such things . . . Stop this talk, and take me to an inn so that I can have a drop of gin, for my throat's on fire."

" But, Granfer, there are no inns here ! " said the little angel.

" What, none? "

" None, I swear it ! "

" How silly you are ! All these beautiful things, and no inns? But where can a fellow go for a sit-down and a glass of gin to comfort himself? Look here, I've come all the way from earth, and I'm tired. The priest used to tell us that in Paradise there was all that the heart could desire, and now . . . It would have been better to go to Hell. Are there inns there? "

" Yes, there are inns there."

" Then take me there, I beg you; what comfort is there in this place, when there's not a drop of gin? In Hell it's bad, no doubt, but I'm used to that; I shall suffer, but now and then I shall have a drink, and that will make up for it."

" It's impossible, Granfer."

" Oh, dear ! " sighed the old man; " this is just like jail ! You can't even go where you like ! "

" You'll get used to it, Granfer," said the little angel, to console him.

" Oh, dear, is there anything else to get used to? " Granfer Matthew sighed again; and began to grow artful.

" Now, my boy," he said to the little angel, " it would be a good thing if you opened an inn here. As soon as I meet Granfer God, I'll tell him, straight to His face, what a good thing it would be. Especially as the tax-collector would hardly dare to call at *that* establishment ! "

" There are no tax-collectors here, Granfer."

" What, none? "

" Not one ! "

" Oh, Holy Mother of God, then truly I shall be comfortable here ! " Granfer Matthew shouted with joy; crossed himself, and went on :

" Now, that's something I really am thankful for ! "

And he went off as fast as he could to find his old woman.

## JOSEPH EÖTVÖS AND HUNGARIAN LIBERALISM

IN the midst of the general reaction which followed the revolutions of 1848 a remarkable book was published attempting to sum up the experiences of revolutions and counter-revolutions from a detached standpoint. The author, Baron Joseph Eötvös, a Hungarian statesman, Cabinet Minister at the early stage of the Liberal revolution of his country, wrote it in German, and addressed it rather to Germany than to his own nation. *Die Herrschenden Ideen des XIX Jahrhunderts und ihr Einfluss auf den Staat* deservedly attracted the attention of John Stuart Mill in England, who refers to it in his *On Liberty*; of Bluntschli in Germany, who quotes it in his *Geschichte der Staatswissenschaften*, and of Tocqueville, Montalambert, Laboulaye in France. Unlike other contemporary commentators, the author of *Die Herrschenden Ideen* was not concerned with the justification of his personal rôle in the events, nor with a chronological narrative. The way he put the question, his investigation and his conclusions were felt to be original. They offer today valuable explanations of the roots of many of our present international problems; besides which the book contains passages that, after nearly ninety years, sound like a prophecy.

Eötvös follows the tradition of Montesquieu, dealing rather with the principles and experiences of history than with history proper. He may also be considered as a precursor of many modern attempts to survey and analyse the time-situation of authors such as Ortega, Coudenhove, Maritain, Huyzinga and Berdiaye—*to name only a few men of different outlook and rank.*

The heritage of the 19th century is one of the principal topics in present-day controversies. Léon Daudet and the *Action Française* denounced this near-past as "*le stupide siècle.*" Gentile and Rosenberg, Fascism and Nazism have made of Daudet's criticism one of their most efficient slogans. The opposing camp defends the heritage attacked but, at the same time, wonders with what modifications it might be maintained, and questions its real meaning. A competent definition and analysis of the ideological inheritance of the 19th century will therefore be relevant for our present-day issues.

We shall deal below with Eötvös as the author of *Die Herrschenden Ideen*, and especially as the foreteller of Nationalistic tyranny. But before we enter into a survey of the book which is today the most relevant among his writings, a few words must be said about



the writer's biography and the circumstances in which this analysis of an epoch was written.

I.

Joseph Eötvös was born in 1813 at Buda, son of the Royal Aulic Councillor (later Vice-Chancellor) Ignatius Aloysius, Baron Eötvös, and of the Baroness Anna von Lilien. His father's family was one of the landed Hungarian gentry, not exceedingly rich but influential. It had received the barony for the services of General Eötvös, our author's great-grandfather, who fought gallantly for Maria Theresa against Frederick of Prussia. His mother's family were German Reichsfreiherrn of Westphalian Roman Catholic stock. On account of his German mother, an admirer of Goethe, Eötvös was completely bi-lingual from early childhood and his knowledge of the German language and literature was even more intimate than that of other learned Hungarians. He was one of those fortunate human beings in whom exceptional mental faculties appearing early were happily assisted by an excellent education and the impressions created by highly cultured surroundings. The social position of his parents had already brought him as a youth into contact with many literary and political events and celebrities of those days. Both Eötvös' grandfather and father had been important public figures of their time. The former held high offices under Joseph II, the latter under Metternich. He, too, as was natural for a gentleman of his birth, was destined for a political career.

Servants of the Crown were not popular among the circles of the patriotic opposition in Hungary. The family tradition might have formed an obstacle to an understanding between our author and the young literary and political movement in Hungary. Later Eötvös was to depart from the authoritarian and loyalist ideas of his ancestors. Nevertheless, his father, a man of true piety and sense of justice and correctness, learned in the law and a highly able administrator, always remained in many ways an example to him.

Eötvös was trained in the classics, mostly by ecclesiastical professors at the Royal Gymnasium of Buda, and later in philosophy and law at the University of Pesth. A counterballast to his *bienpensant* education was his private tutor Pruzzinszky, one of those Hungarian intellectuals who, in connection with the conspiracy of Abbot Martinovics, paid for their fervent admiration of the French Revolution by a sojourn in the Spielberg dungeons. This tutor

forgot neither the ideals of his youth nor his sufferings, but impressed them strongly on his pupil, who soon had another opportunity to realise that all is not at its best in the best of possible worlds.

When, in 1831, amid the enthusiastic manifestations of the young Hungarian nobility for the Polish War of Independence, a terrible peasant revolt broke out in Northern Hungary<sup>1</sup>, Vice-Chancellor Eötvös was charged with the re-establishment of order. The rebellion was cruel and the reprisals severe. On Joseph Eötvös, as on many a young nobleman of his generation, this event made an enormous impression. It was in these tragic days that the future leader of new Hungary, Louis Kossuth, then an official in one of the affected provinces, who by his courage and tact succeeded in putting down the revolt in his district without bloodshed, won his first laurels. In Kossuth's life this experience of 1831 was a turning point; and so very likely was it in the moral evolution of Eötvös, who later often chose peasant revolts as a background for his novels.

The conscience of the more far-sighted Hungarians awoke. What value had the historic constitution and all the "liberties" which the nobles so proudly defended, if the privileged class left the peasants in such a state of ignorance and fanaticism that a wild and absurd rumour—the revolted peasants believing that the cholera was caused by a poisoning of the wells by the nobles!—was able to produce such scenes of horror and savagery? A clear alternative had to be faced: either the nobility would have to extend their "liberties" to the people and do their best through social and cultural reforms for the raising of their standards, or Hungary would become a barbarous country, perhaps ruled by hard-handed Imperial Austrian bureaucrats. There should be no more "liberties," Kossuth proclaimed, but one indivisible human Liberty. "God and Liberty are words that have no plural."

The movement for general reform which started after the Napoleonic wars received a new impulse from the tragic events of 1831, and new militants appeared, among them Joseph Eötvös, who took his seat in the House of Peers soon afterwards,<sup>2</sup> and proved to be a remarkable Opposition parliamentarian.

We cannot here deal adequately with Eötvös's statesmanship, with the various episodes of his life, nor with his literary activities. We should, however, mention his European journey in 1837-38 which gave him an opportunity to get into personal relations in

<sup>1</sup> In the provinces of the present Slovakia and Carpatho-Ukraine.

<sup>2</sup> All male members of a family of peers who had attained their majority were entitled to a seat in this House.

France with Lamartine, Hugo and Montalambert, in England with Carlyle, John Stuart Mill and Newman, in Germany with the brothers Humboldt and many other personalities of the republic of letters. He professes an admiration for the English Constitution and for English letters of those days. This did not prevent him, however, from deeply sympathising with a cause opposed to official Britain, with O'Connell and Ireland, nor from facing the tragic social problems of the then much-praised English industrialism. Attachment to the Roman Catholic faith, the love of liberty and sympathy for the oppressed were the greatest inspiration for Eötvös, as for O'Connell and Montalambert.

The twenty volumes or so which he published include every form from essay to lyric poetry, and from speeches in the Parliament and Academy to novels. In so various an output there are bound to be inequalities. As a literary critic, Eotvos combined all-round information on the intellectual movements of Europe with balanced opinions and refined æsthetic standards. As a speaker, he may be quoted as a classic example of Hungarian rhetorical art, though, owing to a difference in temperament, he had nothing of Kossuth's suggestive brilliancy or rich images, and his arguments are sometimes rather difficult and abstract.

Among his political essays, *The Emancipation of the Jews* (1840) and *On Prison Reform* (1838) are valuable for their rich documentation on these subjects, although they do not add anything new to the liberal and humanitarian views of the time. Among his novels, his story of the 16th century peasant insurrections, *Hungary in 1514* (1846), is remarkable both for its artistic qualities and its deep historical insight. Others of his novels, *The Village Notary* (1845)<sup>3</sup> and *The Sisters* (1857), are a warm advocacy of the cause of the peasant class, in grim realistic colours. His *Journal of a Carthusian Monk* (1842) shows us the author from a more subjective side, which also finds expression in his poetry. In these more lyric works of his, many beautiful passages are unfortunately sometimes spoiled by over-stressed emotions, which are timidly and rather conventionally expressed. Among his plays, *Long Live Equality!* may be mentioned. It is a witty persiflage of his contemporaries, both of his own class of aristocrats and of the lower classes seeking the favours of the aristocracy.

In all fields of literature Eötvös has shown, at least, real talent, and in some fields higher qualities. His main importance, however,

<sup>3</sup> Translated into English and published in 1853 with a foreword by Francis Pulszky

is in his moral and political thought, where for Hungary he represents a landmark, and outside it deserves the attention even of posterity

In political life Eötvös won authority rather than popularity. His more German than Hungarian manner of theoretical controversy prevented him from exercising such elemental influence on his countrymen's imagination as the more robust temperament of Kossuth, or the more dramatic personality of Széchenyi. Nevertheless he stood deservedly in the highest ranks among the men of the Reform movement. After the downfall of Metternich in March, 1848, the Hungarian Constitution was adapted to the contemporary Western model. A national Government was formed, including all shades of the Reform opposition, under the presidency of Count Louis Batthyány.<sup>4</sup> Eötvös was Minister of Education, Arts and Public Worship in this Cabinet. The events of 1848-49 in Hungary are too well-known to need repeating here. Coming into power in March, Batthyány and the moderate members of his government, Széchenyi, Deák, Eötvös and others, had already retired in October, when they realised that their loyal mediation in the widening conflict between the dynasty and the Hungarian Parliament (furthermore, between the Budapest Government and the national minorities) had no longer the slightest chance of success. When open hostilities between the Imperial army and the national forces started, Eötvös left the country and spent the rest of the revolutionary period in Munich. It was there during the years 1849-50 and 1851 that *Die Herrschenden Ideen* was written. Later the author found it necessary to write a second volume on account of new events, mainly the *coup d'état* of Louis Napoleon. This second volume was published in 1854; some of its doctrines were widened by later writings of the author, his *Thoughts* (1864), and numerous political pamphlets and brochures on topical issues, among them the most important being *Hungary and German Unity* (1860).<sup>5</sup>

<sup>4</sup> Whose summary trial and execution by an Imperial Court Martial in the following year so deeply moved all right-thinking people throughout Europe with horror and indignation.

<sup>5</sup> The ideas exposed in this anonymous essay of Eötvös *Die Selbständigkeit Ungarns vom Standpunkte der Einheit Deutschlands, von einem ungarischen Staatsmann*, (Leipzig, 1860) are equally not irrelevant for present-day problems. This brochure is a polemic against those German Nationalists who advocated the inclusion of the whole Austrian Monarchy (i.e. with Bohemia, Hungary, etc.) in a united German Empire. Eötvös thinks that no greater evil could befall Europe—and Germany herself—than such a German hegemony over the Danube basin. He equally rejects the idea of the seclusion of German Austria from the German unity. To his mind German Austria has a double function in Europe, as part of the German unity and as part of a Danubian system under a personal union.

In the years which followed the terror of 1849 Eötvös had to retire from politics. As usually happens to men of a "third party" in great conflicts, his position became untenable. He was suspect to the Imperial conquerors of Hungary, and among the defeated patriots his resignation in the moment of danger was a subject of criticism. He returned to active political life only in 1860 when, after the Italian war, Francis Joseph felt compelled to proceed to a re-establishment of liberal institutions in his monarchy. Taking a leading part in the negotiations between the Crown and the Budapest Parliament, after the compromise of 1867, Eötvös entered the Cabinet of Count Andrassy as Minister of Education. During his last term of office—which lasted until his death in 1871—he had the satisfaction of codifying some of his favourite ideas, such as the complete civil and religious equality of the Jews, and the Statute of National Minorities. This latter law, enacted in 1868, should be quoted as a model of liberal minority policy, though unfortunately, under the successors of Eötvös, it has never been applied in the spirit of its creator.

Among the statesmen of 19th century Hungary, Eötvös was one of the few to whom circumstances have allowed the realisation of some, at least, of the aims for which he stood. While many eminent patriots of his generation had a tragic end, either on the battlefields of 1848–49 or before the execution squad during the terror, in prison or in exile, Eötvös died in the midst of creative activity and official honours. Yet nobody felt more the fragility of the accomplished work of Liberalism, and no one has voiced with more emphasis a pessimistic forecast of the future of Europe. It is on account of these doubts and anxieties that he interests us today.

## II

As already mentioned, the aim of *Die Herrschenden Ideen* was to sum up the lesson of the European events of 1848–49. The author first conceived a history of the French Revolution in relation to contemporary events. He thought also of a parallel history of the 17th century English, the 18th century French and the 19th century German, Italian and Central European revolutions. The material collected for such purpose is largely used in *Die Herrschenden Ideen*. Eötvös found, however, that on the English Revolution little was to be said after Guizot, and about the French Revolution perhaps even less after Tocqueville. Such a large historical work would have led somewhat away from the book's central problem, and he therefore abandoned this as well as another project—a history

of Christian civilisation on the lines of Novalis' *Die Christenheit oder Europa*. Though these plans were not worked out, they indicate three important influences on the author's intellectual evolution, which were Guizot, Tocqueville and Novalis. He learned the methods of historical investigation from the two former, and was impressed by the latter's vision of Europe as a unity of civilisation. As to the influence of Hegel, we have no clear philological indication. Inevitable as some amount of Hegelianism seems with every political philosopher of that time, the terminology of Eötvös is definitely un-Hegelian—a circumstance due, perhaps, to the fact that while German poetry, literature and scholarship (mainly philology and history) were well known and appreciated in Hungary, German, especially post-Kantian, philosophy had no appeal for the Hungarian mind, not even as a rival influence to French and English philosophy and State theory.

The three central concerns of the 19th century are, according to Eötvös, the ideas of Liberty, Equality and Nationality. The idea of Brotherhood which the French Revolution took as its third watchword is an underlying fact in so many other ages and civilisations that it is not necessary to treat it separately in relation to the 19th century. Liberty, Equality and Nationality are ideas derived from each other, but sooner or later, the author holds, they are bound to enter into conflict with each other. Liberty means freedom from every interference outside the will of the individual. To ascertain that he is not subject to any strange will, the individual ought to exercise his own government. If he does so, however, he is bound to rule, and thus by the application of the very principle of Liberty, restriction and, ultimately, even suppression of Liberty arises: the individual is under obligation to take part in the government. He has then also the obligation to obey the laws made under the assumption of his own will by the governing body. Most individuals will, however, not be able to take an effective part in such a government. There is a likelihood that they will invest their share in one person having full power to rule in the name of collective Liberty. Such collective Liberty excludes then the Liberty of the individual.

The more strictly the principle of Liberty is applied, the more it is likely to turn into its exact opposite. The English constitution alone succeeded in overcoming to some extent this eternal paradox of Liberty; but this was because the medieval English constitution<sup>6</sup>

<sup>6</sup> Vol. I, p. 36, ff. of the 1851 German edition.

did not conceive Liberty in the same way as did Antiquity and the French Revolution. For Antiquity, "Liberty" means: a legal status opposed to "Slavery," the judicial status of people entitled to a participation in the government. Still more definitely has Liberty been conceived in this way by Rousseau and the French Revolution. The English constitutional thinkers, on the other hand, conceive Liberty mainly as a protection, as a guarantee against arbitrary interference. English Liberty means mainly personal freedom, the accent lies on the word "person"—the Christian medieval notion of the human person.

The likelihood of the principle turning into its exact opposite is still greater in the case of Equality. Complete Equality means that all limits between individuals, i.e. also the limits set up as a safeguard against interference, vanish. Equality, therefore, conflicts with Liberty. To keep all in a state of Equality, and to suppress attempts to depart from Equality, a strong central power will be needed, established by those who are equal, and making some authority—most likely again some individual—superior in power, and therefore unequal. Both Liberty and Equality regularly appear in history first with a claim for justice, but they are logically (and not only by misuse) bound to turn sooner or later into a claim for domination.

This paradoxical rule applies even more clearly to Nationality. The essence of Nationalism is that the emphasis is laid on some peculiar qualities which a certain nation possesses or pretends to possess when comparing itself to others. The French Revolution challenged aristocratic privileges of birth. Nationality, however, is as much an advantage based on the chance of birth as is aristocracy.<sup>7</sup> Even the origin of the claim of aristocratic and national privileges is analogous. At the foundation stage of realms and empires, aristocratic tribal and national discriminations between nations composing the State vanish. At later critical stages a special class or community claims a privileged leading position within the already stabilised State and bases its claim on descent from the State's founders. In the great Asiatic civilisations, the integrating elements of such communities are common family memories, sometimes family cults. In modern Europe, it is a common language; in medieval Europe, it was the common estate within the social hierarchy. Whether the future evolution in the United States—the most modern State foundation—will produce a similar phenom-

<sup>7</sup> Vol. I, 53 ff.

enon of a special community claiming privileges on account of descent from the State founders, history will show<sup>8</sup>

At any rate, it is certain that, simultaneously applied, the principle of Liberty (defined as a claim for sovereignty of every free individual), the principle of Equality and that of Nationality, are incompatible. Eotvos expects from future development that the conflict between the three principles will appear with growing clarity, and that the party which in his time was the revolutionary party of "Liberty, Equality and Nationality," will be divided into three opposing forces. Liberty will be opposed to Equality and Nationality, Equality both to Liberty and Nationality, and Nationality opposed to Liberty and Equality.

The party of Equality is Communism. It is often said that Communism violates human nature, which is longing for struggle and competition. Eötvös to a great extent shares this Liberal objection. But he does not agree with the Liberal critics that Communism is on that account impossible. Many of the objections in the name of human nature were opposed to other doctrines which played a great part in history, even to Christianity. Eötvös thinks that Communism is possible (with many modifications, perhaps, which time may compel the doctrine to undergo<sup>9</sup>), but he is equally convinced that Communism is only possible in the form of the most oppressive tyranny the world has ever known, at the price of the most complete annihilation of the liberty of the human person. Even at this price, he thinks that Communism would not be able in the long run to suppress the claim of Nationalism. A society of equals will need a strong central power<sup>10</sup> in order to keep down every divergence from standards of equality. For a second or third generation, if not sooner, those exercising this central power will need a claim to prolong their controlling position, and the claim may then again be Nationalism, i.e. the heritage from the State's founders.

<sup>8</sup> Since Eotvos's time it has already been shown that the descendants of the first English settlers have become a sort of aristocracy in America.

<sup>9</sup> Mainly as regards its attitude to military service and to marriage. Eotvos considers that Communism, as much as any other government, will need these two institutions.

<sup>10</sup> Centralism—(Eotvos today would perhaps say "totalitarianism") is a sequence to popular Revolution. One force opposing Centralism in his view is Constitutional Monarchy. The more clearly the limits of separate powers are defined, the more Liberty will exist in a State. Equalising means to make powers unlimited and to concentrate them into one hand. This strongly anti-centralist view of Eotvos may come from some repentance, in face of the Schwarzenberg-Bach system of centralism, of his own advocacy of the abolition of the autonomous county-system in Hungary in the 1840's.



Nationalism is the mightiest of the three ruling ideas of the 19th century, because it is easiest to found in its name a claim for domination. It could be objected that national differences are decreasing on account of quicker communications. This technical evolution will, however, rather increase the possibilities of control for the central power. Railways and cables will facilitate the extension of such power over the most remote provinces. Modern technique increases the devastations of war and will even make war impracticable, the nations will have too great a fear of it. Yet :

“Where war is impossible, peace can only consist in the subjugation of the weak, and the citizens of such (small and weak) States must sooner or later realise that no illusion is more costly than that of a nominal sovereignty”<sup>11</sup>

One might hope that Nationalist claims were really no more than claims for equality. Such hopes are futile :

“A nation of thirty millions will never be satisfied with equality with other nations which count only three millions . . . . The history of the world knows no instance of a people who would have used and not also misused their power after they have conquered in the name of a principle . . . . The principle of equality applied to nations will have the same fate as applied to individuals. This principle is easy to formulate in law, and as a basis of constitutions. In practice, the difficulty of application will appear very soon, because the differences in capacity will soon create differences in position, despite legal equality.

What happens between individuals must happen to an even greater extent between nations. However great the difference of power and strength might be among individuals, it is still greater among nations who, besides the differences of culture and capacity, still have the difference of numbers”<sup>12</sup>

Thus Nationality proclaimed as a principle must necessarily serve only the larger nations. The condition for realising this numerical superiority will be the abolition of Liberty through Centralisation.

What then is to be done? One reply might be, the reactionary programme. As Liberty, Equality and Nationality lead to claims for domination and tyranny, it would be easy to pretend that even for the sake of individual freedom these three ideas have to be repressed in the name of Tradition, and that the existing order should be prolonged by force. Eötvös entirely rejects this

<sup>11</sup> Vol. I, p 65.

<sup>12</sup> Vol. I, p. 151-52.

reactionary answer. It would be futile and sterile. The existing order is as much a domination as future forms of society will be; and those who wish to rule will always find the most efficient way to achieve this end. If they base their claim for domination on order and peace in the present, they will necessarily be weaker in rule than those who base their government on ideas which serve, more logically and more efficiently and with a greater moral appeal, a claim for domination. A purely defensive position would be necessarily negative. It would not offer any vision for the emotions and imagination of the peoples, emotion and imagination are, however, factors of constant and fundamental importance

Should mankind accept the fatality of coming despotisms? Here again our author's answer is a definite "No". It would be equally futile simply to oppose reason to the strong emotional appeal of the ruling ideas. No social order lives only on reason. In the life of mankind as in private life, emotional ties are stronger than rational ones. Whatever might be the precision of a rational policy, and whatever the vagueness of emotionalism, this latter is always more likely to be the stronger. The knowledge of the logical consequences of "Liberty, Equality and Nationality" will, therefore, not prevent the spreading of these strong emotional ideas

The position to be taken should not be one-sided and negative. An ideal policy should attempt to penetrate the deepest motives and emotions underlying liberal, equalitarian and national tendencies, and to bring out the most valuable part of these emotions. Here the question which matters is the criterion of values. To distinguish destructive influences from constructive ones, we must know what the values are which we wish to save. The greatest value to Eötvös is the idea of the unity of mankind, which is most perfectly expressed in Christian civilisation:

"Christianity means liberty in its true sense, not merely as a legal status, as Antiquity, not as a claim for a share in dominations, but in the sense of the liberty of the human being."<sup>13</sup>

In other words, it is the liberty of man to find a personal way to control his emotions and to restrict his claims for domination. Christianity means equality in its true sense, the universal faculty of the soul to approach the Divine.

Finally, Christian liberty and Universality alone can keep Nationality within legitimate limits by relating the values contained in individual nationalities to the values of universal humanity.

<sup>13</sup> Vol. II, p. 13 ff.

The creative policy of the future should aim at the protection of personality against the arbitrary interference of national and equalitarian collectivism. Such a policy must necessarily be Christian. Yet Christianity is utterly challenged by the new age. One of the challenges comes from Science, but this is the less dangerous one. Formerly, Christian dogma consecrated certain ideas on history and science which modern criticism rejects. Dogma, however, conserves its religious relevance, it does not concern physical truths, but a theocentric interpretation of history and society.

A graver challenge than that of Science lies in the conflict between Christianity and Industrialism. This is not because Industrialism consecrates riches while Christianity preaches poverty (luxury is but one of the forgivable sins<sup>1</sup>), but because the rule of Industrialism tries to satisfy man by external means, while the methods of Christianity are internal. The big cities of Industrialism deprive man of his contact with nature, make him dependent for his very food on others, and thus prepare impending tyrannies in a new society of masters and slaves. The liberation of man from this modern slavery should not be the return to nature and instinct as Rousseau preached, but his return to a new realisation of the essence of the Creation and of his own essence as a creature.

Eötvös stresses an analogy with the fall of Rome; the Liberty of slave-holding democracies breaks down, Cæsarism sets in with hardly any resistance, the State itself becomes a system of masters and slaves. Nations with a claim for domination arise. The way out, then, is Christianity.

If the Christian dogma is being challenged, Christian morality is more alive than ever. It is on Christian morality that even Socialism and Communism base their claims, and it is on its account that their appeal for justice to the modern mind does not fail. Dogma and morality will meet again, it was to a world of masters and slaves and from a nation which was the most typical example of Nationalism, the Jews, that came the message of Jesus on true Liberty and Universality.

Here Eötvös anticipates Masaryk's thoughts on a new Christian universality. He precedes also others of our contemporaries such as the new French school of political thought of Mounier, which calls itself "Personalist." Today, when even outside denominational quarters it is thought that Christianity, purified by the present crisis, will contribute to save universality and personal freedom, Eötvös may, without exaggeration, be accepted as one of the guides of our time.

BÉLA MENCZER.

## METTERNICH AND INTERNAL AUSTRIAN POLICY\*—I

“ *J’ai gouverné l’Europe quelque fois, l’Autriche—jamais* ”

—METTERNICH

*Metternich* By Heinrich von Srbik 2 vols 1925

*Der Zerfall Österreichs* By Viktor Bibl 2 vols. 1922.

*Metternich’s Nachgelassene Papier* 8 vols 1880-4

*Tagebücher des Freiherrn von Kubeck.* 1909

*Metternich und Kubeck ein Briefwechsel* 1910.

*Metternich* By Algernon Cecil. 1933.

METTERNICH after his fall denied the existence of a “Metternich System”: but his contemporaries and posterity agree in assigning to him the foremost rôle as defender of the existing order in Europe in the thirty years that followed Waterloo. “Depuis longtemps,” he said in 1824, “l’Europe a pris pour moi la valeur d’une patrie.”

While, however, Metternich’s foreign policy has received full attention from historians (though there is still much documentary evidence withheld from us), the part which he played in the government of Austria during his thirty-nine years of office has been unduly neglected. Yet it was upon the methods of government employed at home that the continuity of his foreign policy rested, and the two complemented each other to quite unusual degree. Abroad the doctrine of Stability allied itself with Balance and Legitimacy against the corroding forces of constitutionalism and nationalism: at home, Stability became absolute rigidity, and the frontiers were in an intellectual sense a Chinese wall designed to keep out all new ideas so far as possible.

If foreign policy revolved round the person of Metternich, home policy was wholly dependent upon Francis himself, who with all his faults was really all-powerful, at any rate in the negative sense that little or nothing could happen without him or against his wishes. With his character and political outlook in the first seventeen years of his reign (1792-1809) we are not concerned here: but it is to be noted that after 1809, the year of Austria’s worst disasters—or, it is sometimes argued, after 1807, when he lost his rather frivolous and pleasure-loving second wife—Francis threw off a certain laziness and triviality and not

\* This article is based upon one of a course of ten lectures on “Austria under Francis and Metternich.” It omits the parallel development in Hungary, which was the theme of two further lectures—ED

merely became still more autocratic, but devoted a much closer attention to public affairs. In the words of Anton Springer—the Liberal Austrian historian, whose book, though possessing a very definite bias, will always remain a classic for the period before 1848—the Government of Austria first assumed in 1809 “a firm shape and an enduring steadfastness in which the nature of its ruler was sharply and clearly reflected.”

Francis was a man of simple tastes who disliked splendour and was devoted to routine. Lacking self-confidence and culture, he was profoundly suspicious and a born pedant. Thus he developed into the typical bureaucrat in a State where the bureaucracy had already become the cement which held everything together. He became increasingly the slave of protocols and “Akte” and formulæ, with a passion for red tape, office-work and audiences in which he listened sympathetically but generally came to no decision. His determination to examine all the details for himself led to a congestion and stagnation of business which grew steadily worse till there were literally thousands of applications awaiting his decision or signature. It was an extreme misfortune that he was not merely surrounded by such men as his adjutant Baron Kutschera, who was both incompetent and of bad morals, but could join the Emperor in his musical quartets, or Baron Stifft, his private physician, or Father Frint, his confessor, men of the narrowest and most pedantic outlook, who really played the rôle associated with witch doctors at a primitive Zulu court—not merely this, but he was extremely jealous of his three able brothers, Charles, John and Joseph; kept the first out of all political life, and, though leaving the latter in Hungary as Palatine, hampered him at every turn. It was only the most shallow and insignificant of them all, Ludwig, with whom he was ever on close terms, and to whom, most unhappily for Austria, he left the political directive at his own death. In the same way he kept able generals like Schwarzenberg and Radetzky at arm’s length, following the principle inculcated upon him in his youth by the veteran Lascy: “A general of whom good use is to be made in the field must never be given influence in peace.” This method he applied all along the line; as Springer puts it—“To no service the full reward, to no force the entire power, to no man the right part.” Metternich was the one memorable exception, and even he was not omnipotent and had surprisingly little say in internal affairs.

There are few more remarkable political partnerships in history and few based on so striking a contrast between the two men—the simple, suspicious, unintellectual, hidebound and straitlaced master, and the elegant, gay dilettante, full of charm and varied interests, dabbling in many subjects, and, though capable of much serious work, always ready to leave drudgery to his subordinates. There was, however, a strong link in their common hatred of the Revolution and in their conviction, amounting almost to an obsession, that it must be challenged at every point, that there can be no concession to it, and that, as Metternich said to Széchenyi in 1825, “if you take one stone out of the arch, the whole thing crashes round it.”<sup>1</sup> But there was the further factor of personal affection, which made Metternich turn to Francis for advice about his marriage and Francis draw up his will in terms of special cordiality towards his Minister. “Heaven,” wrote Metternich in 1820, “has placed me beside a man who is, as it were, made for me. The Emperor Francis wastes no words, he knows what he wants, and his will is always what it is my duty to wish. Leaving aside secondary considerations, he always goes straight towards his goal. He never throws down the glove, but picks it up if it is thrown to him.”<sup>2</sup> This rings true, and Metternich was for good and for ill throughout life “der treue Diener seines Herren.”

He was himself under no illusions on this point, and in 1829 he said to the Russian General Krasinsky: “I know the Emperor Nicholas has the idea that I lead at my pleasure the master whom I serve. But this is to misjudge the Emperor of Austria, for his will is firm and no one can bring him to do what he does not want. If he heaps favours on me and trusts me, it is because I go the way which he prescribes to me: and had I the misfortune to stray from it, Prince Metternich would not remain twenty-four hours Foreign Minister.”<sup>3</sup> As will appear later, Metternich was by no means lacking in ideas as to the internal government of the State, though he never really knew *Austria* so well as either Germany or Italy, in spite of all his years at the Ballplatz. But he was not able to carry out his views, and after pressing them up to a certain point found it wiser not to press them further.

The real power, then, under the Emperor himself, was

<sup>1</sup> Srbik, i, p. 51

<sup>2</sup> *Nachgelassene Papiere*, iii, p. 341.

<sup>3</sup> Srbik, i, p. 454.

always the Ministry of Police, and from 1817 onwards the all-important man was its chief, Count Sedlnitzky, who already found an elaborate system in existence, but made it more all-pervading and irresistible than ever. Though in private life the mildest of men, he was a past-master in the arts of espionage, censorship, denunciation and the intercepting and extracting of letters. He was supreme in his own sphere, and it is utterly incorrect to describe him, as Hormayr did in 1848, as "Metternich's ape" or "police lackey,"<sup>4</sup> or as "the dust on the Prince's soles," to use the phrase of the great Orientalist Hammer-Purgstall.<sup>5</sup> On the contrary, even Metternich was powerless, and in defiance of his orders the police opened letters which Gentz was in the habit of sending to the Hospodar of Wallachia, and which are now a valuable source of our knowledge of what Metternich and Gentz *wished* to be thought of their policy. While Metternich was absent from Vienna, the police even forced Gentz to submit his letters to them.<sup>1</sup>

Next to his system of spies, in which he boasted to have outdone Napoleon's famous Police Minister Fouché, Sedlnitzky's most valuable weapon was the censorship, which on the one hand kept out the foreign Press and the products of foreign literature—and not least of all, of German literature (for instance, Schiller's plays were either prohibited altogether or such obnoxious characters as Vater Moor in *The Robbers* or the Capuchin in *Wallenstein's Camp* were drastically cut)—and on the other hand strictly controlled such writers as Austrian soil produced in spite of all official discouragement. The treatment of Grillparzer, the greatest of Austrian dramatists, whose whole outlook and development were warped and stifled by the control and disapproval to which he was subjected, is typical of the reign of Francis, who was not merely indifferent but directly hostile to all real culture, with the one exception of music. Grillparzer received a severe reprimand and threat of dismissal from the Hofkammer because of a poem on "the decay of ancient Rome," and we have it in his own words: "In the Austria of those days there was no place for a poet." "The invisible chains clank on hand and foot." "Despotism has destroyed my literary life." This means very much, coming as it does from an ultra-Conservative, the author of the famous

<sup>4</sup> *Kaiser Franz und Metternich*, p.t.

<sup>5</sup> *Briefe an Menzel*, p. 103, cit. Srbik, i, p. 494.

poem to Radetzky and of more than one historical eulogy of the Habsburgs.

Similar restraints checked the careers of Lenau, the famous German-Hungarian poet, of Bauernfeld, even of Prince Auersperg, better known as Anastasius Grün, who, when the authorship of *Viennese Walks* was brought home to him after seven years of denial, had to promise silence in order to avoid banishment. And all this at the very height of German romanticism, when south Germany in particular was full of poets and writers.

It is well worth stopping for a moment to consider the mentality of the Austrian censor. The following passages are extracted from the report of Hagelin, the first official censor, in 1795. "That the death of Cæsar, the Roman Brutus, the expulsion of King Tarquin and such subjects are not allowable, goes without saying. Nor can any events from the history of the Arch-House be acted, such as might be to the discredit of these rulers. For instance, the revolt of the Swiss Confederacy from the Austrian sceptre, item the Swiss hero William Tell, the rebellion of the United Netherlands."

"The clerical Estate must not be brought on to the stage at all, even if represented as virtuous . . . . The military is also to be spared, so that no dishonouring action or criticism be thrown upon this reputable class, whose most delicate side is the *point d'honneur* . . . . *Dr. Faust* of Weidmann is objectionable, because the Angel in it shows far less sense in his speeches against the tempter, than Mephisto, who shows far more wit in his counter-arguments in favour of crime . . . . The oaths Mordio, Sackerment, etc., are not to be tolerated . . . . also such exclamations as Jesus Maria, Holy Saints, etc. . . . The expressions Tyranny, Despotism, oppression, are to be used as little as possible . . . . Of the word Enlightenment there is to be as little use in the theatre, as of 'freedom' and 'equality'."<sup>6</sup>

Needless to say, it was equally impossible for a school of historians to flourish. While many of the greatest German historians were in full activity, Austria could boast of nothing but a few harmless collectors of documents such as Chmel and Kurz. The only two who enjoyed a name in their day—Hormayr and Schneller—were of no real consequence whatever, and even they found it necessary to leave the country—the one because he was mixed up in Archduke John's hairbrained

<sup>6</sup> Grillparzer, *Sämmtliche Werke*, ed. Neckar, i, pef, pp. xv-xvii



scheme of a rising, the other because he could not get the censor to permit the publication of his Austrian history, even though it was intended as an eulogy of the House of Habsburg.

The attitude of Sedlnitzky and of Francis towards education generally is altogether of a piece with this. While it was made very difficult for students from the Habsburg Monarchy to go to Germany, those who came from there were closely watched, and at each university special directors of studies were appointed to strengthen the control. This control was applied with even greater severity to the professors, and more than one was deprived on account of his dangerous doctrines.

Specially instructive is the case of Bolzano, who was professor of religious philosophy at Prague, and was denounced for his attempt to provide his students with a rational basis for Christianity. The Maltese Order, whose headquarters were in Prague, and Father Frint, the Emperor's confessor, conducted a kind of heresy-hunt against Bolzano as a disciple of Kant, and against another professor, Fesl, who had endorsed Kant's views on universal peace and had dared to found a Christian Union (Christenbund) at Leitmeritz in Bohemia. His private diaries were seized and minutely inspected by Frint, with the result that Fesl was deprived and interned for four years at the Servite monastery.

During Bolzano's examination Count Saurau, who was then at the head of the Hofkanzlei, laid down the following doctrine, which clearly reflects the mind of Francis himself.<sup>7</sup> "The State," he says, "pays public teachers in order that they may teach those principles which are approved by the Church and by the State administration, and it is a dangerous error if a professor believes that he may teach the youth entrusted to him according to the tendency of his individual conviction or according to his peculiar views." Francis himself gave public expression to this point of view in 1821, when he addressed the professors of Laibach gymnasium in the following terms:—"Hold to the old, for it is good, and our ancestors found it to be good, so why should not we? There are now new ideas going about, which I never can nor will approve. Avoid these and keep to what is positive. For I need no savants, but worthy citizens. To form the youth into such citizens is your task. He who serves me must teach

<sup>7</sup> Extract from a Vortrag of Saurau, of 24 Sept., 1819, quoted by Bibl, *Der Zerfall Oesterreichs*, i, p. 264. On Bolzano, see an interesting passage in Ernest Denis, *La Bohême depuis la Montagne Blanche*, ii, p. 124-8.

what I order. He who cannot do so, or who comes with new ideas, can go, or I shall remove him."<sup>8</sup> On 30 March, 1820, he had given orders for the strict observation of all professors and teachers at schools and universities, and an immediate report in the case of anything which might be regarded as "ordnungs-widrig" (an infringement of order). So faithfully were his instructions observed that all librarians had to draw up and submit special lists of all books taken out by individual professors in the course of the year!

As the tide of liberalism grew, Sedlnitzky issued after the July Revolution a prohibition upon students visiting foreign universities, and he justified this to Metternich by his desire to prevent them from falling into (here is the police-pedant's list *in ipsissimis verbis*) "philosophical materialism, religious rationalism or mysticism, so-called liberalism, the revolutionary principle and the corporative spirit." It was in connection with this veto that a Protestant faculty of theology was founded at Vienna, so that Protestants could for the first time study for the ministry in Austria without going abroad.

As regards the Press, there was nothing whatever except the official organs of the authorities: and this side of things was very closely supervised by Metternich himself, who already as Minister in Berlin in 1805 had been instrumental in the foundation of a journal called "Vaterländische Blätter," which for all its official flavour was the first modern newspaper in Austria, and was edited by such brilliant men as Friedrich von Schlegel, Pilat and Adam Müller, often printed articles drafted by Metternich himself, and aimed at interpreting Austria to foreign opinion, and by its well-informed reports upon east European problems hoped to attract readers in the west of Europe. As Srbik gravely points out, Metternich's whole system rested on "the principle that Press freedom leads to the destruction of the foundations of the State and of society"—a principle which the Austrian historian, writing in 1925, describes as "an sich richtig."

While this police system spread its feelers in every direction, silencing criticism, checking enterprise and encouraging the capital in its habits of superficial pleasure, Francis was confronted with the burning problems of financial and administrative reform. As regards the former, he was really sensitive, and though here, too, he hesitated and often waited too long, he did

<sup>8</sup> *Allgem. Zeitung*, 1821, p. 12, cit. Springer, 1, p. 119, and Bibl, i, p. 284.

at last attempt to grapple with a situation which was becoming increasingly grave. The Finanzpatent promulgated by Count Wallis in 1812 had practically amounted to State bankruptcy. Yet the return of peace found Austrian finances in a desperate state—a large State debt with high rate of interest, masses of paper money, low credit, a deficit, and chaos in taxation. In 1814 the place of Wallis was taken by Count Philip Stadion, the former Finance Minister, who made a really valiant attempt to remedy matters. A series of new Finance Patents (1 June and 29 October, 1816, and 21 March, 1818) established a National Bank for the gradual restriction of paper money, and a sinking fund for the reduction of debt, and gave a solemn pledge never to issue any new paper at a compulsory rate, as had been done in 1812. In spite of many difficulties—not the least being the extreme suspicion of the public—he succeeded by 1818 in wiping out debt to the amount of 126,000,000 gulden and calling in 131,000,000 gulden in notes: and loans were concluded with big banking houses in the west. But Stadion stood in permanent conflict with all the great spending departments of State, and though at his death in 1824 there was a noticeable improvement, the annual deficit had not yet been overcome. Meanwhile methods of taxation were gradually brought up to date and the monopolies rendered more profitable to the State, though, for instance, the special Tobacco Office was not erected till 1834. But endless restrictions on trade remained, beginning with the customs frontier between Austria and Hungary, noble privileges and “Robot” and other peasant forced labour, and again special tolls and dues and octroi rights in the towns: and in all these directions there was no real change till the revolution of 1848.

By 1829 the financial situation was again steadily deteriorating, and Count Kolowrat wrote a special memoir for Francis on its dangers.\* He pointed out that while other Powers had improved their finances during the long peace, Austria had increased her debt by 180,000,000 gulden. The causes which he assigned for this were (1) the excessive interest paid on the Austrian debt, (2) the undue readiness to repay foreign subsidies (in this respect Great Britain was, of course, the chief creditor), (3) the fact that Hungary contributed far too little to the general expenses of the Monarchy, and (4) above all, that far too much was spent on the Army and on Foreign Affairs.

\* Srbik, i, p. 541, based on the original documents in the Staatsarchiv

Francis appointed a commission of enquiry, but nothing happened, and in January, 1830, Kolowrat asked to be relieved of his post, as his suggestions of economy had not been carried out, and as the problem seemed insoluble under the existing conditions. But though Francis persuaded him to withdraw his resignation, and though he had under him several officials of the highest quality, notably Baron Kubeck,<sup>10</sup> none the less little or nothing was done, and the question of financial reform again vegetated.

Thanks to the energy of Radetzky, the state of the Army was greatly improved after 1832, but in every other respect there was steady decay. One reason why nothing was done is to be found in the rivalry of two men, each of whom Francis had come to regard as indispensable, and whom it often suited his suspicious mind, with its dislike for decisions, to play off against each other. These were, of course, Metternich and Kolowrat.

Count Kolowrat, a wealthy Bohemian noble, who had till then held the office of "Oberstburggraf" in Prague, became a Minister in 1826 on the death of Count Zichy, and was not long in acquiring a powerful influence over Francis. He was a man of real ability and knowledge, but vain, ambitious and jealous of all others. He wanted to monopolise the Emperor and enjoy the sole credit for everything.<sup>11</sup> His peculiar character was summed up by Kübeck, who was intimately associated with him, in these words (1832)—"Kolowrat is a man of talent and understanding, but his character is a strange mixture of thirst for action and weak love of quiet."<sup>12</sup> On one occasion Kolowrat burst out to Kübeck: "Believe me, he who has to serve for any length of time in the immediate entourage of the Emperor must be either a philosopher or an intriguer or a mere animal (*ein Vieh*), in order to stick it out (*es auszuhalten*)."<sup>13</sup> To which Kübeck sarcastically rejoined: "Of these three, most people hold to the *juste milieu*, namely, intrigue."<sup>13</sup> In the words of Count Clam-Martinitz, the Archduke Charles's successor as commander-in-chief, "Kolowrat is a child who plays alternately with different dolls, now with the ideal of the all-powerful Minister, and now with that of the independent country magnate." He never lost the outlook of his own class, the

<sup>10</sup> His diaries and correspondence, published in 1908 by his son, throw a flood of light on the inside workings of the old régime

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.*, I, p. 293

<sup>12</sup> *Tagebucher*, I, (11), p. 623.

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 533.

feudal aristocracy of Bohemia, and was not without a certain interest for Czech nationality, though he can hardly be said to have advanced its cause in any way.

Kolowrat set himself to undermine Metternich's influence, and so far as domestic affairs were concerned, he succeeded. From Kolowrat's advent to power, Metternich may be said to have hardly counted at home. On the other hand Francis was too intelligent to prefer Kolowrat to Metternich in foreign affairs and here Metternich held his own, though his jealous colleague often hinted that what really mattered was financial reform, and that "Europe might go hang."<sup>14</sup> Kolowrat seems to have taken the opposite view from Metternich almost on principle: for instance, he favoured a reduction of the army, as a sequel to a modest foreign policy, and he was hostile to the Hungarian Constitution, to which Metternich had a strong leaning, especially after his third marriage, with Countess Melanie Zichy.

Kolowrat, it is only fair to add, had many ideas for the improvement of the administration, and for reforms which he regarded as necessary, but he lacked the steadfastness to force them through against the deadweight of Metternich's negative policy and Francis's hatred of all change. He warned the Emperor that what he called "a wood of bayonets" would lead sooner or later to the very Revolution which he wished to avoid, and that social reforms were vitally needed. But though he periodically offered his resignation because he could not carry his point, and retired for a certain time to his Bohemian estates, he was always persuaded to change his mind and give up the big principle for the sake of some petty concessions. He thus created among the general public the impression that he was of more liberal tendencies than any of his colleagues, but in effect he wavered between the rival views and effected nothing.

What made the situation so serious was that Francis came to depend more and more upon Kolowrat, who occupied in fact, though not in name, the position of a Prime Minister, and that while it suited Francis very well to have two rival Ministers, the result was that, internally at least, most of their energies were spent in counteracting each other, and so nothing got done. This was even more serious than it would otherwise have been because the heir to the throne, Ferdinand, was little better than

<sup>14</sup> cf Srbik, *op. cit.*, p. 541.

feeble-minded, suffered from rickets and epilepsy,<sup>15</sup> and had had a very faulty education. He was quite unfit to govern, and it was not at all clear what would happen if he succeeded to the throne. Already under Francis it was possible to say that Austria was administered, but not governed, and this was to become truer as time passed.

At this period the complicated machinery of State may be summed up under seven main heads (1) the Combined Aulic Chancellory, consisting of one Hofkanzler for home affairs in Austria and Bohemia, and two others for Hungary and Transylvania; (2) the Hofkammer or Aulic Chamber for financial and commercial affairs; (3) the Oberste Justizstelle or Supreme Judiciary, from which Hungary and Transylvania, having their own supreme courts and judicial system, were excluded; (4) the Hofkriegsrat, or Aulic War Council; (5) the Generalrechnungsdirektorium or Accountant's Office, (6) the Polizei-und-Censurhofstelle (police and censorship); and (7) the Haus- Hof-und-Staatskanzlei for foreign affairs and the Imperial Household. At the instance of Kaunitz, Maria Theresa had created the Staatsrat, or Council of State; but the departments of War, Finance and Foreign Affairs were excluded from its sphere, and formed so many watertight compartments, which had no link save written communications. In 1802 Francis, urged on by his brother Charles—who took a very alarmist view of the future unless serious reforms were put in hand—created the so-called “Staats- und Konferenzministerium,” consisting of only six members, including the Emperor himself. The object of this was to co-ordinate affairs and to win a general survey. But owing to Francis's peculiar mentality, this proved impracticable. He could not shake himself free from details, and matters were continually referred to the new body with which it ought never to have been troubled. Lack of system or co-ordination remained as great as ever.

It is highly interesting to note Metternich's attitude to the question of reform. For he combines in a very curious manner the fear of change, the rigid insistence upon order and authority, the detestation of popular sovereignty or democratic institutions, which dominated Francis, with a recognition that it is impossible to govern indefinitely with bayonets, that the monarchical prin-

<sup>15</sup> The confidential report on Ferdinand's health sent by Dr. Staudenheim to Metternich on Francis's instructions (30 April, 1829) is preserved in the Metternich archives at Plass, and is quoted by Srbik, I. p. 546.

ciple is more a matter of convenience and continuity than an eternal, immutable dogma, and that such constitutional machinery as exists must be respected and may even be extended with advantage, so long as the Sovereign is recognised as the source of authority and power. The Hungarian constitution, in particular, was to him a valuable conservative institution, and even the Estates of the various Austrian provinces deserved to be encouraged so long as they did not claim to rest upon popular sovereignty, but merely to represent vested interests and corporations.<sup>16</sup> Above all, Metternich was far too intelligent not to realise the dangers due to red tape, pedantry, slow movement and watertight compartments. One of the first things he did on becoming Foreign Minister was to advocate a reorganisation of the Staatskanzlei archives on modern lines, and this was accepted.<sup>17</sup>

In 1811, however, he made a much more ambitious proposal to the Emperor, which if carried into effect would have revived the old 18th century Staatsrat of Prince Kaunitz, though remodelling it on lines copied from Napoleon's Legislative Council and the Imperial Council of Russia. The root idea—the details of a stillborn scheme need not concern us here—was to have a Reichsrat or Imperial Council for the whole Monarchy, presided over by the Sovereign and consisting of the heads of all the great departments of State—without executive power, but with a mandate to discuss and advise upon such matters of policy as the Sovereign laid before it—and thus to relieve the pressure upon the "Conference of Ministers," which would retain its existing executive powers and would consist more of technical experts, thereby gaining immensely in efficiency.<sup>18</sup> Nothing came of this plan, and the Staatsrat and Conference of Ministers continued on the old lines, working more and more against each other and so paralysing each other's efforts. This became so self-evident that in August, 1814, Metternich, in a series of memoranda, insisted on the need for drawing a clear distinction between the legislative, executive and judicial functions, and argued that it was the lack of this distinction in autocratic States which tended to produce paralysis.<sup>19</sup>

<sup>16</sup> The distinction between Parliament and Estates or *Stände*, between parliamentary and *Ständisch* Government, must be recognised as fundamental, if we are to understand the constitutional development of Austria and Hungary, and indeed of Germany, during the 19th century

<sup>17</sup> *Nachgelassene Papiere*, II, p. 315.

<sup>18</sup> *Ibid*, II, pp 444-53.

<sup>19</sup> Srbik, I, p 459—based on the original archives of the Staatsrat itself, and not hitherto utilised.

Francis accepted Metternich's ideas, and reorganised the Staatsrat as a purely consultative body, formed of the Ministers on the one hand and specially appointed Councillors (*Staatsräte*) on the other, and divided into four sections, legislative, administrative, financial and military. Foreign Affairs were specially excluded, but a link was provided in the fact that the Staatskanzler was also a Staatsminister, and thus a permanent and, of course, very influential member. But the old system, or rather lack of system, soon drifted back owing to the Emperor's inveterate habits of interference with every detail, and his inability to distinguish between the functions of the various bodies. He never learned the difference between administration and government.

To meet one of Metternich's main criticisms, Francis consented in 1816 to the creation of a real Ministry of Finance, on modern lines, instead of the old department. But it was thoroughly characteristic of his methods that the Hofkammer, of which the department of finance had formed a part, continued to survive side by side with the new Ministry, like the Hofkriegsrat beside the Ministry of War. Metternich's proposal for a new Ministry of Justice was disregarded.

In 1817 Metternich went a step farther and submitted proposals for a reorganisation of the central authority, on lines which Professor Srbik describes as federalist rather than centralist. Knowing his master, he was careful to begin by insisting that his plan "contains nothing harsh (*nichts grelles*), nothing subversive, no single daring principle." It was, however, essential "that already under your eyes and your beneficent (*segnend*) hand the supreme authority should be organised in such a way as will form the best defence against by-paths (*Abwege*) or will at least not render them easy." This was a delicate way of hinting that the heir to the throne was quite unequal to any test that required initiative or reflection. "The machine of State works," Metternich reminded Francis, "because its lower mechanism is well constructed and because it has as its head a monarch who is capable of governing." The art of suggestion by implication could hardly go farther.<sup>20</sup> Metternich went on to argue that there are only two alternatives—"complete fusion," which means unrestricted centralisation and is only attainable through revolution, or on the other hand

<sup>20</sup> *Nachgelassene Papiere*, III, pp. 62-75.



a strong central government, tempered by due consideration for local institutions (*Sonderstellungen*). He therefore suggests the creation of a Supreme Chancellor (*Oberster Kanzler*) who will at the same time be Minister of the Interior and head of the whole administration, and four subordinate Chancellors under him: (1) for Bohemia, Moravia and Galicia, (2) for Austria, (3) for Illyria (including Dalmatia), and (4) for Italy. The Hungarian and Transylvanian Chancellories would in some respects be curtailed, but would remain outside the scheme, more or less on existing lines.

It is important to note in all this that Metternich, who already in 1811 and 1813 opposed the idea of overthrowing the Hungarian Constitution, is still as reluctant as ever to see its infringement. The explanation of this lies in a direction already briefly indicated. Metternich always drew a very strong distinction between the principle of popular representation, deriving from the doctrine of popular sovereignty, and therefore in his opinion inevitably leading to communism, the destruction of property and the propertied classes, and on the other hand the principle of the Estates or *Stände*, which represent classes and vested interests rather than individuals and are the chief bulwark of the aristocratic principle. We therefore find him helping Tirol to recover its old constitution in 1816, and Galicia in the same way in 1817: and again he promotes the creation of Diets in Carniola (1818) and Salzburg (1826). He did not, however, regard these bodies as sovereign, or even as representing the province, but only the Estates. They had no legislative or financial powers, and thus no real initiative, though they could tighten the purse strings and exercise a certain amount of control. In 1819 we find him explaining at Teplitz to Frederick William III this fundamental distinction between "*landständische Verfassungen*" and "*ein sogenanntes Repräsentativsystem*."<sup>21</sup> The former he argues, could safely be granted by Prussia, whereas to introduce a democratic constitution would complete the process of revolution.

Even more instructive are Francis's comments on Metternich's meeting with the King of Prussia. Francis thinks it better to leave the idea of "Estates representation" alone, because public opinion is hardly likely to rest satisfied with that. The idea that the Estates might share in legislation he dismisses as

<sup>21</sup> *Ibid.*, III, p. 269.

“risky” (*bedenklich*), and as for a Commission of Enquiry into “my Universities,” he will never allow such a thing, for that would be the surest way of “bringing them into unrest and confusion.” Once again, then, nothing was done, and so far as Prussia was concerned, Frederick William III never redeemed the constitutional pledge which he had given in the great days of victory: while in Austria what Metternich’s son Richard has called Francis’s “belief in the intangibility of written law, carried to the point of timidity (*Angstlichkeit*),” led him now, as ever, to play for time.<sup>22</sup>

Metternich’s proposals were laid in a drawer of the Emperor’s desk, but in 1826 Francis had a very serious illness which left him an old man; and on his recovery he sent one day for Metternich and said very frankly that he wished to free his mind of a sin which, when he seemed unlikely to recover, weighed more heavily upon him than the illness itself. “I have still not followed out your proposal. I shall make good the omission and have enquiry made without loss of time.” Metternich took advantage of this occasion to argue that “it is not enough, as affairs stand today, for Your Majesty to govern. You must assure to your successor the instruments of government.”<sup>23</sup> None the less nothing came of these good resolutions, and after the July Revolution the very idea of reform was odious to him. In June, 1831, he said to Pillersdorff—“I won’t have any innovations. Let the laws be justly applied: our laws are good and adequate. This is no time for reforms. The peoples are, as it were, badly wounded. One must avoid irritating these wounds by touching them.”<sup>24</sup> The last stage is on the last day of the year 1834, when the Chancellor came to pay his New Year respects, and Francis said to him: “I stand once more like a penitent sinner before you: but the year 1835 shall not pass without my debt being paid.”<sup>25</sup> Two months later the Emperor died, and the strange and abnormal situation which arose under his successor put an end to all hope of reform.

This survey shows quite clearly that the chief blame for the stagnation and rigidity of the Austrian system lay not so much with Metternich, after whom popular tradition has named it, as

<sup>22</sup> *Nachgelassene Papiere*, III, p. 8

<sup>23</sup> Schlitter, *Aus Oesterreichs Vormarz*, IV, p. 40 Bibl, *Zerfall Oesterreichs*, I, p. 318: Srbik, I, p. 465.

<sup>24</sup> Kubek, *Tagebucher*, I, p. 438

<sup>25</sup> Srbik I, p. 472, based on letter of Metternich to Hartig, 29 January 1850 (*Plass Archives*).

with Francis, who neutralised his Minister's repeated attempts to repair the outworn machine of State. In the later years of his official life Metternich was always repeating the phrase that the first duty of the Crown was to govern, not to administer, and he must have been conscious that that was exactly the opposite of what his master was actually doing. In an autobiographical fragment written after his fall he commits himself to the view that revolutions "only ripen into action through the fault of the supreme authority, whether this consists of misuse or of non-use of its power."<sup>26</sup> He lacked the energy to resign rather than see what he regarded as vitally necessary simply shelved. But no one can fairly accuse him of not diagnosing the trouble, and in economic matters he was even more far-sighted, as is exemplified by his attitude to the whole question of a Zollverein.

It was not without ground that the disappearance of Francis from the scene in 1835 coincided with a widespread outbreak of acute pessimism. Perhaps it would even be more accurate to say that pessimism inside Austria had been steadily gaining ground for a number of years. Gentz in his latter years became highly critical of the system of which he had so long been a mainstay, and quarrelled with Metternich over it. He saw the future, to quote his own words, "about as black as the grave." Then again, Grillparzer, arch-Conservative though he was, wrote in 1830 "The whole world will be strengthened by the new upheaval" (the July Revolution), "only Austria will fall in pieces as a result": and in 1834 no less a man than Kübeck, one of the ablest and most influential officials in the whole Austrian service, records his view that "Anarchy is at the gates."

Stability remained to the last the note of Francis's Government, and stability was proclaimed as that on which his successor was to rest. A Viennese wag circulated the story that some good patriots wept at the loss of Francis and received the official assurance, "Don't cry, children, everything is to stay exactly as it was." Their reply was, "That's just why we're crying." As we saw, his New Year promise to Metternich remained unredeemed, but on his deathbed he put his signature to two documents containing his political testament and addressed to his son Ferdinand. When Anton Springer wrote his "History of Austria" in the 'sixties they had already been heard of, but on the whole he rejected them as spurious. Since the War, how-

<sup>26</sup> *Nachgelassene Papiere*, VIII, p. 621

ever, Dr. Bibl has had the originals in his hands in the Vienna Archives, and was able to establish their absolutely genuine character. The essence of their doctrine is this: "Don't move in any way the foundation of the State edifice." "Govern and change nothing" (*Regiere und verändere nichts*). In domestic affairs the new Emperor is advised to consult his uncle Archduke Ludwig, while in foreign affairs he is told to give his confidence to Metternich, "my most loyal servant and friend," and to take no decisions without consulting him. No mention whatever is made of Kolowrat. He is also advised to continue his father's unfinished work of modifying the relations between Church and State, in a sense approved by the Pope and in conformity with the decisions of the Council of Trent, and in this he is again to rely upon the advice of Metternich, and also of Bishop Wagner, the Court chaplain.

There is no doubt that there was a deliberate attempt to eliminate Kolowrat altogether, though it did not prove successful. But perhaps the most striking feature was that of all the Emperor's brothers, it should have been Ludwig whom he selected—the one who had fewest ideas and least to recommend him. Charles, John and Joseph—all three men of brilliance and enlightenment—were strictly eliminated from any deciding influence, though the latter was allowed to remain Palatine of Hungary. Ludwig was the wittiest of the family, in a genial, superficial, Viennese way, but he had no talents or governing capacity. The result of the will was that the real power fell from the hands of the dead Emperor into that of a triumvirate, in which neither of the two subordinates, Metternich and Kolowrat, was strong enough to eliminate the other, while the Archduke adopted his brother's traditional policy of playing them off against each other, in the hope that the balance would rest in his own hands.

R. W. SETON-WATSON.

(*To be continued*)

## GREAT BRITAIN AND THE WAR OF HUNGARIAN INDEPENDENCE

AT the opening of the Hungarian Diet of 1847 conditions seemed very favourable for the cause of reform. Since the Conservative Government party adopted a large share of the most important reforms in its own programme, there was no serious obstacle to their being realised. Kossuth's parliamentary tactics of airing administrative and constitutional grievances with a view towards strengthening national opposition were defeated by a majority of one vote at a critical division of the Diet. Towards the end of February, 1848, it seemed probable that Parliament would end its negotiations in peace, after having enacted the main body of the reforms, and that Kossuth would lose his national leadership of ten years' standing. It was at this hopeless juncture of his political career that the revolutions of 1848 broke out. Preceded by the socialistic French revolution of February, 1848, the revolutions which broke out in Western and Central Europe in the course of the next month differed from their French model in this important respect, that they were *bourgeois* movements, aiming at the institution of parliamentary government and the realisation of current liberal ideas.

Kossuth responded to the call of the times with all his emotional impetuosity. On 3 March he made a powerful speech in Parliament in which he demanded a modern constitution, not only for Hungary but for the Hereditary Provinces as well. This demand sprang from his conviction that his rejuvenated country, casting off the shackles of feudal limitation, could no longer be subject to the absolutism of Vienna, but must base its relations with the Austrian provinces on a new footing. The Diet passed Kossuth's motion with enthusiasm, the Upper House showed signs of hesitation and employed dilatory tactics: but meanwhile there came a change in the political situation. 13 March brought the first revolution in Vienna, with the resignation of Metternich and the introduction of parliamentary government into the German, Slavonic and Italian provinces. The news of these events was communicated to the Hungarian Diet by Kossuth himself; on his motion, Parliament proclaimed the liberty of the Press, formed a Committee of National Defence and demanded the carrying out of the full liberal programme, including the introduction of responsible parliamentary government, a wide extension of public education, the adoption of the jury system in the law-courts and the union of Transylvania with Hungary.

Henceforth, Kossuth held unlimited sway over both Parliament and the general public. The intricate procedure of the feudal Parliament became simplicity itself. Kossuth moved the resolutions and Parliament passed them. After the events in Vienna the resistance of the Upper House was broken. The Bills passed at the Diet were conveyed to Vienna by a Parliamentary deputation, headed by the Archduke Stephen, Palatine of Hungary. There followed days and nights of anxious negotiations, resulting on 17 March in the appointment of Count Louis Batthyány as the first Hungarian Prime Minister responsible to Parliament. Batthyány had been a leader of the national movement for years but, in contrast to Kossuth, he was a statesman of moderation. Kossuth could not be left out of the "Great Cabinet" formed by Batthyány, yet the Premier took care to include also Kossuth's political opponents, among them Count Széchenyi, Francis Deák and Baron Joseph Eotvos. This Government elaborated those laws, enacted by Parliament and sanctioned by King Ferdinand on 11 April, 1848, which formed henceforth, up to the Great War, the political basis of the Hungarian State. Among their provisions the most outstanding were the vesting of the executive authority in a responsible Cabinet composed of the Premier and eight Ministers, the change from the feudal Diet to a modern Parliament based on popular representation, the union of Hungary and Transylvania, the abolition of all feudal privileges, including the nobility's immunity from taxation, the proclamation of the liberty of the Press, and the acknowledgement of a complete equality and reciprocity between the different religious denominations.

The vital significance of the April laws lies in the fact that they realised the concept of the "regnum independens," the sovereign and independent kingdom as defined by the laws of 1790, in a manner which did full justice to the national and liberal ideals of 1848. They marked a complete break with the feudal system by introducing the political and social institutions of Western Europe.

Similarly, they marked a complete break with the absolutistic system of the Vienna Government. It is evident that Ferdinand's counsellors must have watched the course of events with utter repugnance. Their attitude is best reflected in the memorandum which Count Kolowrat submitted to the King and Emperor on 20 March, only three days after Batthyány's appointment as Prime Minister. The "so-called" Cabinet of Batthyány and Kossuth—so runs the memorandum—may produce disastrous results by their policy of uniting Transylvania, Croatia and the military frontier-

districts with the main body of Hungary; henceforth, instead of heterogeneous countries, a compact Hungarian State would be the partner of the Austrian Hereditary Provinces. To prevent this, a Royal Commissioner must be dispatched to Transylvania with the duty of strengthening the party opposed to the union. As to Croatia, arrangements have to be made for the appointment of an energetic and reliable Ban.

Kolowrat's proposals did not fall on deaf ears. Two days later the State Conference appointed as Ban of Croatia Baron Joseph Jelačić, a candidate of the Illyrian (or Southern Slav) party. The British Consul-General in Belgrade, commenting on this appointment, remarked with surprise that Jelačić was carried over the heads of 39 colonels who were senior to him, passing from the grade of Colonel to that of Lieutenant-General—an advancement unprecedented even in the case of Archdukes of the Imperial Family. Successive events showed, however, that Ferdinand's Government had found the right man for their purposes. The appointment of Jelačić was the first step in the far-reaching scheme of the Government of Vienna which put the nationalities living on Hungarian territory in the service of its absolutistic policy, using the old principle of "divide et impera" to wreck the newly-found freedom of the Hungarian State. In order to achieve its aim it was ready to foment a racial war—a terrible responsibility from which the Viennese Government cannot be absolved.

The double dealing of the Austrian Government is clearly revealed in the official despatches of Lord Ponsonby, British Ambassador at the Court of Vienna. Ponsonby was a staunch Conservative who felt completely at home in the reactionary atmosphere of Ferdinand's Court. It was through his despatches and the reports of Blackwell, British Agent at Pest, that the Foreign Office was kept informed of new developments. These documents tell of the growing wave of discontent and rioting among the Croats. True to the secret aim of his appointment, the Ban of Croatia, instead of checking these revolutionary symptoms, gave them further encouragement by ignoring the instructions of the Palatine and the Hungarian Government and forming a State Council of his own. Owing to the representations of the Hungarian Government the Court of Vienna disavowed the policy of the Ban. Here is Lord Ponsonby's comment, in a despatch to Lord Palmerston, dated 12 May, 1848: "The demand made by the Hungarians that an order should be sent to the Banus, to place himself under the orders of the Palatine of

Hungary, that is, that he should acknowledge the authority of the Hungarian Diet and Government, was consented to by the Imperial Government . . . It is certain that the Banus knows the reason by which the Imperial Government was moved, and it is believed, as well as hoped, that he will content himself with silent disobedience. He knows that the Hungarians are unable to enforce the order." Ponsonby was right: the Royal orders transmitted to Jelačić by the Palatine remained unfulfilled. Under pressure of the Hungarian Government a Royal manifesto was issued on 10 June passing a severe censure on the Ban for his lawless arrogance and ordering his deposition from his office. A few days later this order was revoked and the Archduke John was appointed to mediate between Jelačić and the Hungarian Government. In the course of these negotiations, conducted on the Hungarian side by the Premier, Count Batthyány, the Hungarian Government went to the utmost limit of concessions by granting all the demands of the Croat national party. Jelačić seemed inclined for an amicable arrangement, and actually made a promise to Batthyány that he would demobilise his army if the Croatian demands were granted. But the forthcoming agreement was frustrated by the intransigence of the military party in Austria, more particularly by the War Minister, Count Latour. On his instigation, Jelačić demanded the centralisation of all military and financial affairs in the hands of the Austrian Ministry, thus revealing himself to be not a spokesman of Croatian national interests, but an instrument of Habsburg absolutism. When the Hungarian Government refused to accede to these illegal demands, the Imperial Government issued a proclamation branding the Hungarians for assuming control over their own military and financial affairs. On 4 September, Jelačić was reinstated by a Royal Patent into his office and showed his gratitude by an immediate invasion of Hungarian territory, leading his troops against the "rebellious" Hungarian Government<sup>1</sup>.

Events now followed each other in quick succession. In view of the national emergency the Hungarian Parliament authorised the raising of 40,000 soldiers for self-defence, without waiting for the Royal consent. Meanwhile negotiations were carried on in Vienna, but Batthyány and Deák were persistently refused admittance to the King. Even after the failure of his mission Batthyány did all in his power to redirect events into the channels of legality. But the unparalleled hypocrisy of the Imperial Government roused

<sup>1</sup> For the antecedents of the war cp Hóman-Szekfu, *Magyar történet* Budapest, 1936<sup>3</sup>, vol V, p. 383 foll.



bitter feelings in Hungary, the radical elements were constantly increasing in strength, and Batthyány's hold on the people was gradually slipping from his hands. As a last attempt at conciliation, he and the Palatine effected the appointment of Count Francis Lamberg as Royal Commissioner charged with the negotiation for an amicable settlement. Kossuth and the extremists declared Lamberg's mission illegal, forbidding him to conduct negotiations; next day, the Count was recognised and murdered by the radical mob. This act destroyed all hopes of reconciliation. On 3 October King Ferdinand issued a manifesto dissolving the Diet and placing all troops stationed in Hungary and Transylvania under the command of Jelačić, whom he also appointed Royal Plenipotentiary and Commissioner. Count Latour, the Austrian War Minister, issued a decree ordering the Austrian troops to march against the Hungarians. This decree led on 5 October to the outbreak of a new revolution in Vienna and the murder of Latour. Vienna was, however, soon surrounded by the loyal troops of Prince Windischgrätz. The Hungarian army failed to relieve the siege of Vienna, which was taken by Windischgrätz on 31 October. Meanwhile, after the resignation of the moderate Batthyány Government, the chief authority in Hungary passed into the hands of the Committee of National Defence, formed of members of both Houses of Parliament. It was as President of this Committee that Kossuth became the real leader of the Hungarian people, organising all the forces of the nation for defence. We must ascribe it to his untiring efforts that after the fall of Batthyány's Cabinet the country did not sink into anarchy and chaos but, on the contrary, was united in a collective resistance unknown since the times of Rákóczi. Kossuth was animated in his work by an almost mystical sense of his mission; the ideals of national self-defence and of European liberalism rendered his flights of eloquence irresistible. In a short time he created literally out of nothing an army which was soon able to oppose the Imperial troops. Meanwhile, the war caught the Hungarians unprepared and caused them some military reverses. It was under the shadow of these reverses that the Austrian camarilla and the new Prime Minister, Prince Schwarzenberg, brought about on 2 December the abdication of Ferdinand in favour of the young Archduke Francis Joseph, whose accession was declared unconstitutional by the Hungarian Parliament. Kossuth's overtures for peaceful negotiation were met by Windischgrätz's demand for unconditional surrender. A month later Windischgrätz's troops entered the Hungarian capital. Emboldened by his military

victories, on 4 March, 1849, Francis Joseph ordered the dissolution of the Austrian Parliament, and proclaimed the *constitution octroyée* which virtually annihilated the Hungarian constitution. The new Schwarzenberg régime, more reactionary than the system of Metternich and Kolowrat had been, hereby returned to the idea of a "Gesamtmmonarchie" based on extreme centralisation, that is to say, it revived a system which had been put to the test, with utter failure, by Leopold's counsellors at the end of the 17th century.

The annihilation of Hungarian liberties proved, however, to have been premature. With the approach of spring the Hungarian army assumed the initiative. In the last days of March Arthur Gorgey was named Commander-in-Chief, in less than a month he had won three considerable battles, and on 22 April he entered the fortress of Komárom, the key of the west, in triumph. Bem in Transylvania and Perczel in the south were equally successful. The Hungarians were masters of their country once again and Windischgrätz was removed from his command. But Gorgey's advance produced political consequences undesirable both to the army and its commander who had fought for legality and the April laws. Kossuth thought that the time had arrived for answering the *constitution octroyée* of 3 March. Though the majority of his countrymen were decidedly against such a move, the Parliament of Debrecen voted on 14 April unanimously for the Declaration of Independence which proclaimed for ever the deposition of the perjured Habsburgs from the throne of St. Stephen; until the form of government should be finally decided, Kossuth was asked to carry on the executive. The Austrian Government answered this step by soliciting the armed assistance of the Emperor of Russia, and on 11 May came the Czar's manifesto in reply: "We shall not refuse." Henceforth, the cause of the Hungarians was hopeless. "Attacked from every point of the compass, and weakened by fatal internal dissensions, the various Hungarian corps fought with a bravery that did not belie their reputation of a thousand years; and Görgey did not finally lay down his arms at the feet of the Russian commander until 13 August. . . . On 5 October General Klapka, the last warrior of the struggle for independence, surrendered the fortress of Komárom; and on the following day the bloody assizes were opened at Arad."<sup>2</sup>

How was it possible, one might ask, that things were allowed to come to this pass? Sproxton is certainly not exaggerating when

<sup>2</sup> Cp. Ch. Sproxton, *Palmerston and the Hungarian Revolution*, Cambridge, 1919, pp. 25-34.

he remarks that "the unprejudiced student must decide, in nine cases out of ten, for the Magyars as against the Government at Vienna." How can we then account for the fact that the just cause of the Hungarians failed to enlist the support of foreign Governments?—though not of European public opinion, whose sympathies were frankly and violently pro-Hungarian. But the official authorities looked on with cold blood as the gallant fight of the Hungarians for their constitutional rights went down under the military blows of two mighty Empires. We must try to find an explanation for this startling fact which must, in the last instance, be referred to the general European situation.

When, in the spring months of 1848, the establishment of an independent Hungarian Ministry received the Imperial sanction, the condition of Europe was very favourable to the Magyar claims. The Assembly of the German States at Frankfort took up a friendly attitude towards Hungary and, on 22 July, declared unanimously for an alliance with the Government at Pest. But it was from Great Britain and France, the two free and constitutional Powers of the west, that Kossuth hoped for the greatest things. England had always been the declared enemy of reaction, and the avowed friend of struggling nationalities; while Lamartine, as head of the Provisional Government of the French Republic, made the following statement to an Hungarian delegation on 15 March: "Hungary has as many friends in France as there are French citizens." Kossuth's fatal error of judgment was that he took these protestations at their face value. As a fervent liberal, he was convinced that England and France would support a free and independent Hungarian State, and even believed in the moral obligation of these two countries to defend, if necessary by force of arms, the constitutional conquests of April, 1848. His interpretation of Lord Palmerston's foreign policy was fundamentally mistaken. To quote Sproxton again: "Palmerston believed that the independence of Hungary was quite incompatible with the one essential task which the Dual Monarchy had to perform—the turning back of the tide of Russian aggrandisement westwards and southwards. Kossuth beheld the English statesman's policy in Italy, believed that it was dictated by purely anti-Austrian sentiments, and naturally deduced therefrom the further belief that Palmerston could not choose but look favourably upon the Hungarian movement. This was a fundamental mistake; for Palmerston was not the murderer, but the surgeon, of Austria. As he saw things, the cession of the Italian Provinces was the

amputation calculated to fit Austria for her real life-work, to make Hungary independent was to cripple the Monarchy of its most vital organ."

I think Sproxton's explanation is substantially right. Palmerston saw the Hungarian problem in terms of European politics, in his eyes, true to the traditions of British foreign policy, the maintenance of the balance of power was of overriding importance. At that time Russia was the bogey whose advance westwards was the great scare; Austria's rôle, according to Palmerston, was to stop that advance. For that reason, he resisted all tendencies which could have weakened the military and economic strength of the Habsburg Monarchy, and refused to acknowledge the fact that the national movements of the 19th century had already undermined the foundations of that Empire.

It is to this attitude of Palmerston's that we must also attribute the final failure of Blackwell's mission. A J. Blackwell, an Englishman of considerable literary talent and an acute judge of men and events, had come to Hungary in 1843 as an agent of the British Government, originally with the object of establishing trade connections between the two countries. It was the time when Great Britain and the German "Zollverein" were rivals for the market of the Central Danube area. To facilitate economic connections between England and Hungary a project was launched for setting up an Hungarian commercial agency in London, on the other hand, the establishment of a British Consulate at Pest was warmly advocated by Blackwell and by Sir Robert Gordon, British Ambassador at Vienna. These plans met, however, with a serious setback after 1846, when Sir Robert's term of office expired. His successor, Viscount Ponsonby, was a fervent admirer of Metternich and completely unsympathetic to any separate deal with Hungary. As a matter of fact, his narrow-minded outlook prevented him from viewing the Hungarian problem from any other angle except that of the Austrian Government and the inspired periodicals. His despatches to Palmerston dealing with the critical events of 1848 in Hungary are dull reading, and reveal his incapacity to see the real importance and proportions of things. They contrast unfavourably with the "wonderfully unbiased" reports of Blackwell (the epithet is Sproxton's), which furnished the Foreign Secretary with full and enlightening details about the work of the Diet and the general political conditions in Hungary. Blackwell commented on the appointment of the first responsible Hungarian Cabinet with the utmost satisfaction, emphasising the fact that its members were

chosen from the most moderate men of the Liberal party. In a report to Lord Palmerston, dated 25 April, 1848, Blackwell expressed his conviction, that the Austrian Empire was "already virtually dissolved, and that no power on earth would be able to reconstitute it." In the same report he records a highly interesting conversation with Count Louis Batthyány, in the course of which the Hungarian Premier expressed his view that the "Austrian Hereditary States would be incorporated in the nascent Germanic Empire," and that, therefore, "the question arose whether Hungary should look for support to Germany or to England."

"The British Government must show," said the Premier, "that England is aware of the political as well as the commercial importance of Hungary. . . . It is my firm conviction that the moral support of England is all that we require. If this support be afforded, the discordant social element of our country will be speedily neutralised; but if the British Government should hesitate—should continue to be ignorant of Hungary as an independent kingdom—we must look to the Germans, and strive to render our political and commercial interests compatible with those of the German Confederation."

This offer of English orientation, tendered by the Hungarian Premier within a month after his appointment, passed completely unheeded. The British Cabinet did not take any official notice of the formation of an independent Hungarian Government, though it was sanctioned by Royal consent. In May, 1848, notes were despatched by the Hungarian Government to the French and British Foreign Office, urging the establishment of regular diplomatic intercourse. From the answers to these notes it became apparent that the Hungarians were unable to obtain a recognition of their independence from either Government. Kossuth's disappointment found expression in his speech on the defences of the country, which he delivered in the Lower House of the Diet on 11 July. He advised his countrymen to rely on their own strength, England would only assist them in so far as she found it consistent with her own interests. As to the French, they were indeed the "heralds of freedom in the old world, but it would never do to make the existence of the Hungarian nation dependent on the protection and alliance of France. . . . France was far away. Poland, too, had relied on French sympathies. The sympathy had indeed existed; but Poland was no more."

With the setting-in of European reaction and the open outbreak of hostilities the chances of diplomatic recognition became even more remote. Owing to the dilatory tactics and chicanery of the

Imperial Government, the question of Austro-Hungarian relations and the setting-up of Hungarian diplomatic representation never reached a final solution. Consequently, when Count Ladislas Teleki was appointed Hungarian Minister in Paris, the French Ministers refused to acknowledge his diplomatic character and received him only in a private capacity. A similar fate was reserved for Ladislas Szalay, who came to England at the beginning of December, appointed by the Committee of National Defence. On 11 December, Szalay sent his credentials through the post to Palmerston. Two days later he received the following reply from Lord Eddisbury, Under-Secretary for Foreign Affairs :

Sir,

I am directed by Viscount Palmerston to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 11th inst, and in reply I am to say that Viscount Palmerston is sorry he cannot receive you. The British Government has no knowledge of Hungary except as one of the component parts of the Austrian Empire, and any communication which you have to make to Her Majesty's Government in regard to the commercial intercourse between Great Britain and Hungary should therefore be made through Baron Koller, the Representative of the Emperor of Austria at this Court.

In his answer, Szalay refuted the charge that Hungary was one of the "component parts" of the Austrian Empire, with a quotation from the famous Tenth Article of the Diet of 1790-91, an Act sanctioned by King and Parliament, which had established the independence of the Hungarian kingdom beyond the shadow of a doubt, he also drew the Foreign Secretary's attention to the immense resources of the kingdom and expressed his conviction that Hungary was "qualified to form the centre round which further provinces may group, and will group, themselves, capable of forming a sufficiently great and extended political organisation to afford guarantees for order and for wise and beneficent liberty."

In reply to this second letter, Lord Eddisbury informed Szalay that Her Majesty's Government could take no cognizance of those internal questions between Hungary and the Austrian dominions to which Szalay's letter referred, and reminded the Hungarian envoy once more that the British Government could receive communications respecting Hungary only through the diplomatic organ of the Emperor of Austria at the Court.

After the failure of Szalay's mission the Hungarian Government abandoned their attempts at recognition. They had to discover

the bitter truth that political support of Hungarian independence lay outside the orbit of British foreign policy, and that British public opinion, too, showed an almost complete indifference to the Hungarian cause. Sproston is probably right in saying that "for thousands of citizens—and these not the lowest class—on this side of the North Sea, the term 'Hungary' was nothing more than the second half of a compound, and the Magyars were regarded as Austrian provincials." Within a few months' time there came, however, a complete change. This was brought about mainly by the activity of one man, Francis Pulszky, former Under-Secretary for Foreign Affairs, who landed in England at the end of February, 1849. A man of wide interests and versatility, whose Memoirs give a most vivid account of the age, Pulszky saw the futility of pressing any farther the Hungarian claim for recognition. His way of approach to the problem was to influence public opinion through the Press, and by establishing valuable personal connections. Soon after his arrival in England he was introduced to Lord Lansdowne, a prominent member of Lord John Russell's Cabinet. He also paid an unofficial visit to Lord Palmerston, who received him cordially. In the course of their conversation Palmerston condemned the policy pursued by Austria, but advised the Hungarians to come to terms with the Austrian Government. He pointed out that Austria was Great Britain's natural ally in the East, whose existence was a European necessity, as it would be impossible to preserve the balance of power if small, independent States were substituted in its place.

The main object of Pulszky's mission was, however, the winning over of public opinion. To this task Pulszky showed himself to be fully equal. Within a month of his coming to England fourteen important papers had opened their columns to him. He soon had a group of talented English friends devoting their journalistic efforts to the cause which he represented. Chief of these were John Richard Kemble, the historian of the Anglo-Saxons; Charles Henningsen, a versatile and travelled man, who later became Kossuth's secretary; Professor Francis Newman, Charles Pridham, and Josiah Toulmin Smith, the archæologist. Among the newspapers which printed the articles of Pulszky and his friends were *The Daily News*, *Morning Advertiser*, *Spectator*, *Examiner*, *Observer*, and even Lord Palmerston's most ardent champion, *The Globe*. In addition to their powerful Press campaign there was also a growing group of M.P.s in both Houses of Parliament who were convinced of the justice of the Hungarian cause; among them were Lord Dudley

## WAR OF HUNGARIAN INDEPENDENCE. • 567

Stuart; Richard Cobden, the champion of Free Trade, and David Urquhart, that curious example of modern knight-errantry, the sworn enemy of Lord Palmerston and Russia.

The campaign started by Pulszky and his English friends achieved its principal aim—it was brought home to English public opinion that Hungary was a political formation independent of Austria, and that the oppressive line of policy adopted by the Imperial Government was completely illegal. Pulszky kept on emphasising the constitutional character of the Hungarian movement; the Declaration of Independence of 14 April caused him, therefore, considerable embarrassment. But this temporary embarrassment was pushed into insignificance by the grim reality of the Russian intervention. British public opinion was stunned by this new development, and the Hungarians firmly believed that England and France must do something at last. In Sproston's words: "In May, 1849, it was no longer a question of the independence or subjugation of Hungary merely, but of the naked and avowed aggrandisement of Russia towards the west. England, whose great object of dread was that expansion, which would upset the balance of power, must now see how European liberties were in truth bound up with the Magyar cause. Moreover, Turkey was now quite definitely threatened, and, with Turkey, the commercial interests of England in the Near East." The British public was at last stirred in its equanimity. On 26 July Lord Beaumont presented in the Upper House a petition from the City of London itself, praying for the immediate recognition of the existence, *de facto*, of the kingdom of Hungary, for reasons of "justice, policy, commerce and humanity."

This petition followed close upon the heels of the full-dress debate of the Russian invasion of Hungary, held in the House of Commons on 21 July. Palmerston's speech in the course of this debate is one of his great parliamentary successes, since he managed to restore by it the wavering Liberals to their allegiance. The stand taken by the pro-Hungarian section of the House was, on this occasion, indeed, a firm one. Seven M.P.s, among them Bernal Osborne, Monckton Milnes (afterwards Lord Houghton, Keats's biographer), and Lord Dudley Stuart, summarised before the House the just claims of the Hungarians, pointing out the international danger which the annihilation of Hungarian independence by the armed force of Russia would involve. A tribute was paid to the Hungarian constitution, granted more than 600 years ago, and to the early institution of the Parliamentary system, only a few years after its introduction



into England. This ancient political independence of the Hungarian kingdom was now threatened with destruction. "The new constitution"—Monckton Milnes pointed out—"would entirely destroy the existence of Hungary as a separate kingdom, and would change Austria from a confederation, of which Hungary formed part, into one homogeneous empire." The achievement of this aim through the force of Russian arms would deal a severe blow to the constitutional Governments, and would strengthen the powers of despotism. Austria herself would become a mere tool of Russia—the fear of which led Lord Dudley Stuart to express his conviction that the "true establishment of the balance of power in Europe would be in the restoration of Poland, and the re-establishment of both Poland and Hungary as independent States."

This last remark was the answer of the Opposition to the main argument of Palmerston's speech. The Foreign Secretary, whose speech preceded that of Lord Dudley Stuart, remained faithful to his well-known attitude. He recalled the ties created by former alliances with Austria, and then, in a remarkable passage, laid bare the essentials of his policy with regard to Central Europe. "There are higher and larger considerations," he said, "which ought to render the maintenance of the Austrian empire an object of solicitude to every English statesman. Austria is a most important element in the balance of European power. Austria stands in the centre of Europe, a barrier against encroachment on the one side and against invasion on the other. The political independence and liberties of Europe are bound up, in my opinion, with the maintenance and integrity of Austria as a great European Power; and, therefore, anything which tends by direct, or even remote, contingency to weaken and to cripple Austria, but still more to reduce her from the position of a first-rate Power to that of a secondary State, must be a great calamity to Europe, and one which every Englishman ought to deprecate, and to try to prevent." This statement of the Government's foreign policy withered, of course, all Hungarian hopes for British moral support or even mediation, though Palmerston's speech, destined to calm the temper of his Parliamentary opposition, contained several friendly references to Hungary. Replying to Lord Hamilton's speech, which had struck the only discordant note in the debate by representing the Hungarian constitution as an engine of tyranny and Kossuth as the spokesman of the privileged magnates, Lord Palmerston made the following statement: "I firmly believe that in this war between Austria and Hungary there is enlisted on the side of Hungary the

hearts and the souls of the whole people of that country. I believe that the other races, distinct from the Magyars, have forgotten the former feuds that existed between them and the Magyar population, and that the greater portion of that people have engaged in what they consider a great national contest."

In another passage of his speech Palmerston put clearly the disquieting alternatives of the war, as seen from the angle of British policy. Whatever be the issue of the conflict, Austria would in either case be weakened. Should the Hungarians be successful, and should their success end in the entire separation of Hungary from Austria, "such a dismemberment of the Austrian Empire would prevent Austria from continuing to occupy the great position she has hitherto held among European Powers. If, on the other hand, the war being fought out to the uttermost, Hungary should by superior forces be entirely crushed, Austria in that battle will have crushed her own right arm." Palmerston's final verdict is that "even the success of Austria, if it is simply a success of force, will inflict a deep wound on the fabric and frame of the Austrian Empire." He thinks, therefore, that "not simply on the principle of general humanity, but on the principle of European policy, it is devoutly to be wished that this great contest may be brought to a termination by some amicable arrangement between the contending parties." To effect this amicable arrangement Palmerston hinted at the possibility of British mediation, but at the same time emphasised that this "interference ought not to be carried to the extent of endangering our relations with other countries," meaning, of course, that Great Britain would not lodge a diplomatic protest against the Russian invasion of Hungary.

It follows from the general tenour of Lord Palmerston's policy that his offer of British mediation could not be whole-hearted. Both Sproxton and David Urquhart doubt the sincerity of this move. Indeed, Urquhart points out that, although England had "absolute command of the whole question, of Austria by her power, of Hungary by her influence," Palmerston did not decide to mediate until 1 August, by which time the cause of the Hungarians was hopeless. Even then, according to Urquhart's ironic comment, "the mediation was published in London, without having been received at Vienna." It so happened that *exactly the day before* it reached Vienna, Prince Schwarzenberg had started for *Warsaw*. In his letter to Palmerston the British Ambassador at Vienna expressed his regrets that he had no opportunity of carrying out his Lordship's instructions; however, Prince Schwarzenberg "will

probably *not* return before the end of the week. Before that week ended Hungary was finally blown up."<sup>3</sup>

Sproxton's ingenious interpretation is that "Palmerston, who had underrated the force of the Hungarian movement during the closing months of 1848, in the spring of 1849 saw the very existence of the Austrian Empire threatened. The Russians alone could save it; so the Russians should save it, and meet with no protest from the Foreign Office"

On 21 August the report of Görgey's surrender reached London, and in a letter dated on the next day, Palmerston expressed his satisfaction to Ponsonby at the successful termination of the war in the following words: "I must own I am glad that it is over, for though all our sympathies in this country are with the Hungarians, yet it was scarcely in the nature of things that they should be able, against such superior forces, to hold out long enough to compel the allies to treat with them on equal terms." In another passage of this letter Palmerston expresses his hope that the Austrian Government will make a "just and generous use of the success which has been gained," will "re-establish the ancient Constitution of Hungary," and will "publish a real and complete amnesty." But, he adds significantly, "if the Austrian Government listens to passion, resentment and political prejudice, they will enlist against them every generous and just mind in the civilised world, and will lay the foundation for permanent weakness and decrepitude in the Austrian Empire."

It was the second of these alternatives which finally carried the day, and the Austrian reprisals exceeded the worst apprehensions of the British Foreign Secretary, leading to passionate utterances on his part. This wave of indignation was reinforced by the Austro-Russian demand for the extradition of the Hungarian refugees, which set Great Britain firmly against Austria and Russia, and nearly precipitated an armed conflict several years before the outbreak of the Crimean War.

N. J. SZENCZI.

<sup>3</sup> David Urquhart, *Progress of Russia*, (1853).

## A STATE OF HOSTILITIES EXISTS . . .

THE beginning of the present hostilities in China may be taken as the Spring of 1935. The trend of events is quite clear. China was beginning to become a united and a modern country. Roads were built and buses ran where no roads had existed since Imperial days. Small towns built themselves electric light stations and installed cinemas. Western medical knowledge was spreading. It is true that many of the men who set themselves up as doctors in small villages had only been "dressers" in some hospital, but, on the other hand, some of the doctors were of world-wide renown. Dr. Wu Lien-te and Dr. Sun Ko-chi are well known to the world outside China. American-trained dentists, too, were replacing the wandering "quack," with his torturing pincers. A new class of low-paid clerks and professional men had slowly made its appearance. These demanded things of beauty in their homes, things that were cheap, because not much could be paid for them, but things that were beautiful. Small pieces of lacquer, tiny stone seals, exquisite little things in porcelain, all became treasured possessions in homes ugly with poverty. Out of their forgotten shops came the old craftsmen who could make such things or could train men to make what was wanted once more. The system of education, which had been rather top-heavy, with more men to teach the integral calculus than to teach children their A B C, began to settle. The school books were inclined to beat the patriotic drum (one geography book, for example, put the ancient frontiers of China on the Black Sea and blandly remarked that the intervening territory had been seized by Russia in the twentieth century); but all schools did valuable work in teaching the Kuo Yü or national language of China. The children learned it in school. Grown-ups who could afford a wireless got their lessons in daily broadcasts. China was slowly becoming a nation.

But to this there is another side which is only too often forgotten. That is, that China is a country of some four hundred million inhabitants, and that human affairs move slowly. The whole four hundred million Chinese did not get up and say: "We must modernise our country." The missionaries of modernisation were a comparatively small and very mixed collection. Some were idealists, some were rogues, some were xenophobes who wanted to drive the foreigner into the sea, some were

xenophils who liked everything foreign, good or bad, some wanted comfort, some wanted to make money, and so the list goes on. And opposed to them was the Conservative with whom they generally had to compromise. The sight of three scholarly Chinese dressed in long blue gowns, black shoes and black round hats with a button at the top, playing tennis with another dressed in faultless tennis flannels, is a sight which has to be seen to be believed. Presumably the scholars liked the game but did not like white clothes, so they played the game but kept their own.

While this great social revolution was gradually being accomplished, the National Government had to face two political problems.

The first was an internal problem. The Government of Canton was, to all intents and purposes, independent. The National Government had to bring it into the fold as peacefully as possible. At the same time there were the Communist armies that were being chased by the Nationalists all over China, but which as yet had escaped destruction. These Communists were patriotic Chinese, but the Nationalists feared them as rivals in the struggle for the control of China when it should finally be united.

The second problem concerned Japan. Japan wanted to carve out an Empire for herself at China's expense, and the National Government realised that Japan would strike while China was still absorbed in achieving her own unity. The Chinese then had to play for time. They had to postpone the inevitable Japanese attack until they could produce a well-equipped modern army to resist. At this time, the Spring of 1935, there were only the unreliable provincial levies available to fight the Japanese, for what regular troops there were, were fully occupied in chasing the Communists. Consequently, the Chinese Government pursued a complicated series of bewildering political subterfuges. Ministers were inconveniently ill when the Japanese presented unwelcome demands. Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek would be out hunting Communists when the Japanese wanted immediate replies. All Ministers professed strongly pro-Japanese sentiments, and, with baffling politeness, mournfully deplored their inability to do anything to help the Japanese "at the moment." This kind of "opera bouffe" certainly prevented any attack on the capital, and the fighting that did take place in the North was more or less ignored by both Tokyo and Nanking. The Chinese also had to decide where to make their final stand when the Japanese should break off negotiations and start fighting in earnest. They

decided on Szechwan. This province is the biggest in China proper. It borders on Yunnan (which is very rich in minerals) and Tibet, and is only about 125 miles from Burma. One gets to it by going some two thousand miles up the Yangtse. The province is defended from attack by mountain ranges, and has a population of seventy-six million or so inhabitants.

In Japan the trend was different. Politically, the farmers combined with the military to tax the merchant. The military wanted to conquer China, and with this aim in view, the moderate politicians who stood in their way were, one by one, eliminated. In Japan, a government cannot be formed unless two Ministers, one appointed by the Army, one appointed by the Navy, are included in the Government. If, therefore, the Army or Navy refuse to appoint anyone to serve under a certain Prime Minister, that Prime Minister cannot form a Cabinet.

Other tendencies came to the surface too. There seemed to be a feeling that Japanese art and culture and the life of the ordinary Japanese was not understood by the rest of the world, and that the great social movements in that country had been ignored. A desire was born, therefore, to explain the meaning of all this to the outside world and to try to convey to the uninstructed Westerner the full meaning of Japanese life. This desire found expression in various ways. Private individuals wrote books telling about their lives, their families and their social conflicts, and the Tourist Bureau brought out beautifully illustrated booklets describing the Tea Ceremony, the orange blossom and its place in Japanese life, Japanese architecture, the "No" plays and so on. It was very well done.

There was a good deal of dissatisfaction in the "white collar" class, which found the cost of living too high for its meagre salaries. This sometimes found an outlet in xenophobia of a mild kind. "Why should we make cheap things for the blasted foreigners when we get paid so little for it?" would sum up this point of view. The general unpleasantness of a low standard of living was aggravated by the financial chaos of the country, where internal loans became a standing joke.

The other countries concerned in the East were Russia, France, Holland, England and America. The Russians were occupied in freeing themselves of embarrassments in the form of interests in Manchuria, in building, for military reasons, another alternative route for the Trans-Siberian Railway, and in teasing the Japanese on the Manchurian border. The French were fully

occupied in keeping what they already had. The English and the Americans, after having failed to come to an agreement with Japan on Naval Limitation, finally came to the conclusion that if they did not soon look after their interests in the East they would soon have no interests to look after. Their inaction during those years caused a loss of prestige for which both England and America are still paying. The Dutch found that economising in higher education in the Dutch Indies meant that the natives went to Japan for their higher education, where they were told that the Queen of Holland was a wicked old woman.

There was much talk of the "White Chain"—a sort of unofficial agreement between England and Holland to the effect that in case of war with Japan, Holland and England would be allies and keep the Japanese out of the Indian Ocean. There is no official confirmation of the existence of any such agreement.

One can now briefly study the history of this undeclared war.

#### THE COMMUNIST CAMPAIGN

The "Communists," who at first were scattered in small bands, were, by this time, organised under able Chinese generals and propagandists into a vast horde. Although the reports coming from the various people who visited their independent State are often biassed by their own political views, yet certain facts emerge which give a clear idea of a fairly efficient organisation of a type not often met with in modern times. The area occupied by this horde was between thirty and forty thousand square miles. The people were mostly young. That is to say, that the proportion of people over thirty years old was less than is usual in a normal community. Stress was laid on education. Not only were all recruits taught to read and write, but also the original population of the land where the horde had settled. The State was economically balanced and more or less self-supporting. It was partly agricultural and partly industrial. When the horde moved, the heavy machinery was carried along too. When it got to a new place the rich men were killed, the title deeds which showed the ownership of land were destroyed. Land, said the leaders, belongs to the State and should be cultivated for the good of the horde, just in the same way as manufactured goods are the property of the people and are distributed to each according to his needs, or sold to others in exchange for some commodity needed by the horde as a whole. The inhabitants of any newly-conquered town were generally impressed to carry

the loot and baggage, but if he had a shilling or two a man could generally buy himself out. Those who were impressed were not too badly treated as a whole, and later on they usually joined the horde as recruits. Other men and women joined voluntarily. The farmer who had been ruined by taxation, the educated man who had no work, the craftsman who faced a long life of toil for little reward, the bandit who feared capture, and also many genuine sympathetic idealists, swelled the ranks of the horde and replaced those who died by the way.

While the tribal god of the horde was Marx, and one might therefore have expected some new departure in its economic life, in practice there does not seem to have been very much difference between this and any other horde. In former cases the chief called himself a king or khan, and in this case he did not, but there the difference ends. In each case, between intervals of fighting, the soldiers planted crops and reaped them, in each case the women and craftsmen spun, wove and made clothes under the control of the Commissariat. Everything was done by the horde, for the horde. In the time of Tamberlane, when a man did well he was promoted and given new and richly-jewelled armour. If the modern Chinese "Communist" soldier did well, he was promoted and given a new rifle. The idea of great private wealth does not arise in a horde until it has gained great conquests and success. The horde never got to this point.

The Chinese army which got the most glory from the Japanese invasion of Shanghai in 1932 was the 19th Route Army under General Tsai Ting-kai. A too popular army, in a State which is not closely knit, is a danger to the Government, and, after the Shanghai incident was over, the 19th Route Army was accordingly moved to Fukien to fight the "Communist" horde, which had settled in a large area comprising the west of that province and most of the neighbouring one, Kiangsi. However, neither the 19th Route Army nor the "Communists" wanted to fight, so an agreement was made between them that each would leave the other alone. The ordinary routes for trade were left open, and the country enjoyed peace. There was a certain amount of trade. Then suddenly General Tsai Ting-kai raised the standard of rebellion against the Central Government. It is fairly certain that lack of money was the cause of this. The revenues from Fukien were not sufficient for the support of the Army, and the remainder of the cash presumably came from the Central Government. When the 19th Route Army refused to fight the



“ Communists,” supplies ceased, and General Tsai Ting-kai, who counted on the support of other provinces, revolted. The other provinces, however, were too wary, and refused to join in, and the 19th Route Army, dispirited, was driven like sheep from the province and disarmed by the Central Government troops.

This comparatively unimportant civil war had two far-reaching results. The first was financial. Bank notes in China are printed with the name of the issuing office. And, in the days before the Central Government, bank notes issued in one town were only accepted at a discount in another town. It was rather as though you could only get nineteen and six in London for a pound note issued in Manchester. The Central Government, however, had changed all that by founding the Central Bank, which everywhere accepted its own banknotes at par. It did not matter at which branch office the note had originally been issued. It was accepted at par by all other branch offices of the Central Bank.

The 19th Route Army seized the Foochow Branch of the Central Bank; but in spite of this, the Foochow banknotes, each bearing a surcharge, showing that it was issued by the Foochow Branch, were still redeemed at par by the Government Banks. This action had a tremendous effect. It created confidence in the Central Bank and in the other Government Banks. The Chinese began to have confidence in their own banknotes once again. “ Central Banknotes are good—everywhere ! ”

The second far-reaching result was to put the Central Government troops next door to the “ Communists.” The Government attacked the horde, which at the end of 1934 started its great march of over two thousand miles. The course was roughly L-shaped, a thousand miles west and then a thousand miles north to Kansu and Shensi, where they were safe from attack. It was a great achievement. The horde drew a thin red line of war across the breadth and length of China. The line sometimes divided, sometimes doubled back on itself, but slowly it wound its way through Szechwan (1935) up to its goal. And behind the horde came the Government troops, harrying the stragglers, bombing the main body with aeroplanes, and always consolidating what they had won, until at last the horde passed out of their reach.

In December, 1936, Chiang Kai-shek, Generalissimo of China, was in Sian, quite near the territory of the horde. One

of his Marshals, Chang Hsüeh-liang, suddenly decided to kidnap him, and did so. The story goes that the Generalissimo was caught while having a bath, which has the merit of humour, but the sequel was pure comedy—except for one point: Chiang Kai-shek opened negotiations with the horde, negotiations which finally ended in September, 1937, when the Communist horde became the National Government's Eighth Route Army on the Northern Front against the Japanese. Troops marched and counter-marched. Many of Marshal Chang Hsüeh-liang's troops deserted and joined the horde. The Generalissimo resigned, said he was unworthy, and then took up office again. The Generalissimo went home, taking his kidnapper with him as a "guest." Finally, the "guest" was tried, sentenced to imprisonment and set free! The main story is clear enough. General Chang Hsüeh-liang persuaded the Generalissimo to negotiate with the horde and yet managed to keep his friendship. The rest is not so clear.

Just about this time the Japanese "Manchurian" Army launched an attack from Chahar into Suiyuan.

#### THE NORTHERN CAMPAIGN

The political geography of North China and the neighbouring States may be roughly described by a capital E. The top stroke is Russia; then, reading from left to right, the middle stroke Outer Mongolia, subject to Russia, and "Manchukuo" (Manchuria), subject to Japan; and the bottom stroke Inner Mongolia and the Northern end of China. The rest of the page below the E represents China proper. Peking and Tientsin are on the extreme right of the lower stroke of the E.

In June, 1935, the Japanese military authorities demanded the withdrawal of Chinese troops from the region round Peking. China at that time was fully occupied with the world silver crisis, and could do nothing except obey. The Chinese troops moved out and Japanese troops moved in. To avoid trouble, a demilitarised zone was set up in which desultory fighting could be carried on without seriously inconveniencing either party.

The Russians, following their plan of getting rid of anything which might prove an embarrassment in their foreign policy, sold their rights over the Chinese Eastern Railway to the "Manchukuo" Government for the paltry sum of about ten million pounds (one hundred and forty million yen, plus thirty million yen for paying off the staff, etc.). This meant that they

lost control of the connecting link between the Trans-Siberian Railway and the South Manchurian Railway. The Japanese promptly altered the gauge of this strip to fit their own trains, which run on a narrower track, so that troops could be brought direct by train from Dairen to Harbin at any time. Japan was moving nearer to Russia.

In the North of China war fever grew. The Japanese continued to occupy the country and made more and more demands. In other parts of China, luckless Japanese civilians were set upon by mobs and beaten or killed. Part of North China was declared an autonomous State by the Japanese.

In the meantime Japan had been extending her influence in Inner Mongolia and, in the Spring of 1936, thought she was sufficiently secure to turn her attention to Outer Mongolia. A long series of border "incidents" had paved the way for a drive through Outer Mongolia towards the Trans-Siberian Railway. But in Outer Mongolia she caught a Tartar. The Mongolians knew how to fight. They had modern arms and aeroplanes supplied by Russia, and after severe fighting the Japanese troops were repulsed. They did not attack again.

In November, 1936, Manchurian and Mongolian troops invaded Suiyuan, but were repulsed. By the Spring of 1937 Japanese influence had spread down to the Yellow River. The part of Inner Mongolia under Japanese control declared itself an "independent" State, "Mongokuo." Two quite serious military engagements on the Russo-Manchurian frontier had been settled rather to the advantage of the Japanese, and Japan felt that the time was ripe for the invasion of North China. All China north of the Yellow River was to be conquered and carved into puppet States. The war started with the Japanese holding manœuvres near Peking. Fighting broke out, and about two hundred Chinese and twenty Japanese were killed. The engagement seems to have been a wild, unorganised affair, probably starting more or less by accident. It is recorded, for example, that one of the Japanese shells landed on the bed of a local Chinese magistrate, who, fortunately for him, happened to be out of it. It is hardly likely that the Japanese gunners were aiming at that bed, or even at that particular house. The general impression one gets from descriptions of the fight is of a minor conflict with plenty of wild shooting and lots of excitement for everybody. But this conflict started the war. On receipt of the news of this engagement, the Chinese Government at once

presented the Japanese with a note demanding an indemnity and the punishment of the Japanese officers concerned. Before the Embassy officials could get over their surprise, Chinese troops were already being moved to the North.

In August, 1937, the Tungchow Massacre occurred. It was one of the many occasions on which Chinese or Manchurian troops under Japanese control revolted against their masters, but it is important, because it attracted a certain amount of attention and because descriptions of it were used by both sides for propaganda purposes. The Japanese garrison in Tungchow was normally some three thousand strong, and round the garrison had grown up the usual town, more or less dependent on the military. Merchants and shop-keepers and their wives, restaurant keepers, waitresses, civil officials and the usual mixed group of people whose living comes more or less directly from an army, all made up the Japanese civil population of the town. One day, the troops marched out to fight the Chinese forces, which were unpleasantly near, leaving only about a hundred Japanese soldiers in the town. The Chinese "allies" revolted, attacked the garrison and massacred any Japanese who could not escape into the fort. The Japanese, although outnumbered, held out until they were relieved.

At this time the Japanese evacuated their nationals from the Yangtse valley, and shortly afterwards the Shanghai war began. Both the Yangtse and the Whangpoo rivers were blocked by booms, hastily erected by the Chinese.

In the meantime the Shantung war had also begun. Tientsin fell to the Japanese, and while the northern army took the Nankow passes and drove south, the army in Shantung drove west to meet it.

By January, 1938, the Northern Japanese army had crossed the Yellow River and laid siege to Tsinnan, the capital of Shantung. Both Tsinnan and Tsingtao fell, and Shantung was soon in Japanese hands. In Tsingtao Chinese looters had destroyed some twenty million pounds worth of Japanese property before the Japanese forces took possession of the town.

Japan withdrew her ambassador from China.

By the middle of February, 1938, the two Northern Japanese armies had joined up and had together penetrated deeply into Northern China. Paotao and Taiyuan were in Japanese hands, but the Chinese armies still held Kaifeng and Hsüchow. In the centre of China the Japanese Shanghai Army, which had taken

Nanking, was pushing its way up the Yangtse River, and, at the same time, was trying to connect up with the Northern forces. The Northern campaign then entered the Lunghai Railway phase. The Lunghai Railway, which was stubbornly defended by the Chinese forces, was heavily fortified along the two hundred mile strip running through Chengchow, Kaifeng and Hsüichow. North of this strip, parallel to it as far as Kaifeng, runs the Yellow River. This river brings down so much silt on to its banks that it raises them above the level of the surrounding plain. The surface of the river is sometimes as much as twenty or thirty feet above the level of the ground. If the banks are broken the river changes its course, flooding the surrounding country and bringing death to millions before cutting out a new bed for itself. In June, 1938, the banks of the Yellow River were cut at Kaifeng. Many Japanese detachments were in the flood area, which extended over a thousand or more square miles; but nevertheless by July, 1938, the Northern Japanese Army had joined up with the Shanghai Army.

#### THE SHANGHAI WAR

The Shanghai war got undue publicity. What really happened was very simple. After a series of "incidents" the Chinese forces outside Shanghai engaged with the Japanese naval forces on land. The Japanese got the worst of it until reinforcements arrived, when they made an encircling movement and surrounded the town. They then drove south to Hangchow, west up the Yangtse River towards Hankow (which became the capital of China after Nanking had fallen) and north to join up with their Northern Army. Fighting broke out in Shanghai in August, 1937, and the town was taken in November, 1937. Nanking fell in December of the same year.

In Shanghai most Europeans live and work in a small neutral area of about six square miles. The area is divided into two administrations. One is the International Settlement, and the other is the French Concession. North of this, across a creek is a strip of land running along the bank of the Whangpoo river, which is nominally part of the Settlement, but is really Japanese. On Saturday, 14th August, the Chinese Air Force made two raids on the Japanese flagship *Idzumo*. The one in the morning did not do much damage, but the one in the afternoon proved conclusively (among other things) that if you drop a couple of bombs into a place the size of Piccadilly Circus you will kill

about a thousand civilians. The fact that the bombs, which killed in all about one thousand and eighty people, fell in a neutral area, made it much easier to count the corpses. It may be noted that the Chinese and Japanese Governments take a very different view of the damage done to neutrals. When the Chinese aeroplanes bombed the International Settlement and the French concessions, or bombed the American liner *President Hoover*, the Chinese Government at once apologised and said that it was an accident. The Japanese, on the other hand, when they bombed and sank the American gunboat *Panay*, fired on the British gunboat *Ladybird* (on 12 December, 1937), or machine-gunned Sir Hughe Knatchbull-Hugessen, the British Ambassador to China, merely apologised and said that it was a mistake. The difference, is of course, obvious!

After the bombing of Shanghai by the Chinese aeroplanes, the British and American women and children were evacuated, the British to Hongkong, the Americans to Manila. Both places received the refugees with the cordiality for which the Far East is justly famous. Manila had a first-class earthquake, and Hongkong the worst typhoon that they had had for years. With true democratic feeling, however, the people of Manila said that they would have had their earthquake even if Mrs. Theodore Roosevelt Jr. had not been among the refugees.

An interesting experiment succeeded in Shanghai. This was the *Jacquinet Zone*. As the fighting at Shanghai spread round the neutral areas, so many refugees sought shelter that there was room for no more, and the gates were closed. Father *Jacquinet de Besange*, a Jesuit who had been through the European War of 1914-1918, asked the Chinese and Japanese commanders to agree to a scheme by which part of the Chinese town next to the French concession was to be partly surrounded by barbed wire, treated as neutral territory and kept free of troops. Both sides agreed and kept their promises faithfully. A quarter of a million Chinese civilians took refuge in this zone, and were fed, housed and medically treated until the time came when they could return to what was left of their homes. The work was done by a devoted body of volunteers, and it is worth noting that subscriptions included money contributed by Japanese.

After surrounding Shanghai, the Japanese army swiftly cut its way to Nanking. When they entered the town, the feeling among civilians was one of relief that the war was over for the time being so far as they were concerned. They thought

that the entrance of the Japanese troops signified the restoration of law and order. This feeling quickly changed. The Japanese troops, fired with blood lust, got quite out of hand and looted, raped, tortured and killed for several days before they could be got under control once more. It has been estimated that about a hundred thousand Chinese were killed in Nanking alone. This massacre, with the one which was said to have occurred in Soochow, stiffened Chinese resistance. A Chinese farmer could think to himself, "If I stay here behind our lines, I shall be bombed and killed. If our line retreats, I shall be killed. I had better either move with my family to Chungking, 1,500 miles away, or else join the army and at least have one shot at the enemy before they kill me."

In August, 1938, the Japanese had another fight with the Russians, this time on the Russo-Manchurian border at a place called Changkufeng, which is a hill of strategic importance. It is not very clear who started the fight, or who won, though on the whole the Japanese seem to have got the better of it. The Japanese troops were subjected to heavy artillery fire lasting some days and withstood it well. The troops at Shanghai, on the other hand, did not give many examples of that fanatical courage for which the Japanese Army is famed. It is said that they were reservists.

In October the Japanese landed troops near Hongkong and drove up to Canton. The Chinese military leaders, who had been boasting about what they would do to the Japanese if they landed in Kwantung, burned Canton to the ground and retreated. The Japanese got to Canton without fighting a major battle.

In November, the Japanese finally drove through stubborn Chinese resistance and took Hankow. Father Jacquinet went to Hankow himself, got there before the advancing Japanese troops, and opened another Jacquinet zone. The neutrality of this zone was also respected, and it formed a refuge for some hundred thousand Chinese civilians.

The course of the war can be clearly traced. From the invaders' side the plan was first only to invade North China and to occupy it down to the Yellow River. When hostilities spread to Shanghai, the plan changed to an attack on Nanking, the capital of China. It was thought that when Nanking fell China would sue for peace. When this failed, the Japanese then tried to cut off all communications by which arms and ammunition could be brought in to China. Canton was

accordingly attacked, and pressure was brought to bear on French Indo-China.

From the defenders' point of view, the first stage was to put off the war until China was ready, and in the meantime to get loans, to unite the country, and to build fortifications against the inevitable attack. China was greatly hindered by the American Government's policy of putting up the price of silver. So serious were the effects of this that, after desperate efforts had been made without success to prevent silver from leaving the country, China had to call in all her silver dollars and adopt a "managed" paper currency. When the war finally broke out the plan was to retreat, fighting hard all the way over a wide front down to the line of fortifications at the Yellow River, where the main resistance was to be made. When the war spread to Shanghai the plan was to retreat up the Yangtse to Szechwan, fiercely disputing every inch of the ground. The many Chinese civilians who fled before the Japanese advance, carrying all they could with them, also had to be cared for to a certain extent. They were directed into the interior—to Chungking, to Yünnanfu, to Chengtu. There were several millions of them.

When the lines of communication were cut by the Japanese the Chinese made new ones, roads into Burma, into Russia and westwards along the old silk route.

#### THE INTERNAL AFFAIRS OF CHINA

For the last five years the Japanese have been trying to come to an agreement with the Chinese on more or less the following lines:—China should recognise "Manchukuo"; China should suppress all anti-Japanese agitation and the political party known as the Kuomintang; Japanese advisers should be appointed in all branches of the government organisation, both civil and military, to help China put her house in order, and all advisers of other than Japanese nationality should be sent home; and that China was not to borrow money from any country except Japan, who would lend her as much as she thought fit. China, of course, would not accept these terms; but as refusal meant war and China was not ready, she had to pretend to agree without committing herself too deeply. The pretence was kept up by appointing "pro-Japanese" officials wherever was necessary. Chief of these was Prime Minister Wang Ching-wei, who was expelled from the Nationalist party in December, 1938, but who played his galling rôle with gadfly



impishness for as long as he was of use. These officials did what the Japanese told them in the way which gave the Japanese most trouble. In 1935, for example, the Japanese demanded the abolition of the Peiping (Pekin) Political Council. And abolished it was, overnight, leaving nobody at all to carry on negotiations! The people, of course, could not understand the deep policy of their Government and thought that these men who were really serving their country were traitors. Many died at the hands of their own people, and even Mr. Wang Ching-wei, carefully guarded though he was, was seriously wounded by the bullets of a would-be assassin.

Another trick the Chinese played was to use to their advantage the fact that the Japanese Army acted independently of the Japanese Government and its ambassadors, who were sometimes rather in the dark as to what was going on. When, for example, Major General Doihara had arranged for the Northern provinces to become "autonomous" in November, 1935, the Nanking Government made another arrangement with the Japanese Ambassador by which the provinces should not become "autonomous," and then gently told the General that it could not be done because the Japanese Government would not agree.

In the meanwhile China became more modern and more unified. By the end of 1936 the Hankow-Canton Railway was completed and commercial air-lines covered the main trade routes through the length and breadth of the country. The Mayor of Greater Shanghai, Mr. Wu Te-chen, broke with the past and began marrying people in batches at a cheap rate. Chinese families sometimes mortgaged themselves for life to pay for a family feast. The new system meant that a couple could get married without borrowing money, and so could start married life at an advantage instead of being heavily laden with debt. This was a great step forward.

In the summer of 1936, the National Government of China at last got control of Canton. The Southern provinces of China, Kwangtung and Kwangsi, which were governed by Canton, were in fact, independent of the National Government. They had their own Government, their own army and their own currency. In June, 1936, General Chen Chi-tang, of Canton, sent his armies north, telling them that they were going to fight the Japanese. In reality he was going to invade the territory of the National Government. But the national spirit of China had grown, and when his troops found themselves faced by Chinese

instead of by Japanese, they refused to fight. General Yu Han-mou, with part of the Canton air fleet, then went over to the Central Government and General Chen Chi-tang fled abroad. General Yu Han-mou, with poetic justice, was then appointed "Pacification Commissioner" under the Central Government. General Yu was still in charge of Canton when the Japanese attacked the town. He left Canton without fighting, and for that, it is said, he was executed.

In 1937, Dr. H. H. Kung made an extensive tour in Europe and America to raise loans and commercial credits for China. A credit was arranged in America for buying railway materials. Hostilities broke out so soon afterwards that not much more could be done. The credit of China in the world market was then as high as it had ever been before.

#### THE INTERNAL AFFAIRS OF JAPAN

Some interesting books, as well as those published by the Tourist Bureau, were written by Japanese during the last few years explaining Japan to the world. They were quite numerous and one can only mention a few. *Father and I*, by the son of Lafcadio Hearn, the author of those charming tales of Japan which are still a delight to read, draws a picture of family life from the child's point of view. *Facing Two Ways*, by Baroness Shidzué Ishimoto tells the story of the growth of democracy and modern thought from the point of view of an enlightened aristocrat, and *Japanese Lady in Europe* by Haruko Ichikawa, gives an account of a trip in Europe, where everything is seen from a gently humorous Japanese aspect.

In internal politics the story is a monotonous one of moderates being pushed out of power by extremists who wanted war with China. There were plots and counterplots, assassinations and revolts. In 1935 some fifty odd men were tried for complicity in a futile conspiracy to blow up the Cabinet. In 1936 part of the Army revolted, killed Mr. Takahashi, the Minister of Finance, Admiral Viscount Saito, Lord Keeper of the Privy Seal, tried to kill the Prime Minister and Prince Saionji, and seized part of Tokyo. The revolt was quelled and the ringleaders either committed suicide or were shot. In the summer of 1937 the swing went the other way and a more liberal Cabinet got into power, but by that time the armies in China were practically independent of the civil power.

In October, 1936, was passed a new act dealing with

Dangerous Thoughts. In order to prevent people from getting into trouble by thinking dangerously, which is illegal, special offices were to be opened throughout the Empire to teach people what they should think. In this way it was hoped to reduce the annual number of those arrested for thinking dangerous thoughts. This humane gesture helped to keep people out of jail.

The financial state of Japan was very bad, even as early as 1935. By that time the Japanese Government had already borrowed some ten thousand million yen, mostly by means of internal loans, and confidence in government stocks had fallen off. Government bonds were laughed at in Japan, and nobody wanted them. The Minister of Finance, Mr. Takahashi, opposed the Army and Navy when they wanted to raise more money and this was probably the reason why he was killed in 1936. But his death was a great loss. From that time onwards, Japan has become poorer and poorer. Elaborate exchange restrictions were imposed (the same thing was also done in China) and gold was shipped abroad to balance exchange. Japan is not able to buy many things from abroad. She pays for her imports with her exports, and the exports which she can sell have diminished because of the war in China.

#### CONCLUSION

The effects of the hostilities in China are likely to be far-reaching. From a trade point of view, the white man, including the German and the Italian, will be driven out of China; from a political point of view, to have the Japanese so far south threatens the line between Singapore and Hongkong and constitutes a threat to Indo-China, the Dutch colonies and the Philippines; from a sociological point of view the Empire of Japan will have to go through a period of far-reaching political and social re-organisation which will begin as soon as the troops get back to Japan and are demobilised, while the remaining free Chinese in the mountains of Yünnan and Szechwan, who are composed partly of the surviving refugees (many died on the way) and partly of the original inhabitants, will breed a strong and hardy race, if they are not poisoned by the opium which grows there. It is so easy to think of a war as being waged between impersonal machines. One is inclined to forget that an army is made up of individual men, each with his own hopes and fears. And that it is on the children of these men and on these children's mothers that the future of their countries depends. FAR EAST.

# DENIS GARSTIN AND THE RUSSIAN REVOLUTION

## A BRIEF WORD IN MEMORY

It was in 1916, or rather the beginning of 1917, that I took Denis Garstin with me from London to be with myself and the late Harold Williams on the staff of the Propaganda Mission in Petrograd.

I brought that Mission on our head, for I had originally planned it, and the Foreign Office was so greatly pleased with my plan that they sent me back to Russia to run it. But alas! Planning a thing and running it are two different things. Nor had I planned it with any idea that a revolution was to be part of it! Nor was I by temperament the right person. Nor certainly was Harold Williams the right person. His knowledge of Russia and Russian was profound, and he was an enchanting man. But both he and I were idealists. He was wiser than I but more of a dreamer. I was ignorant and energetic in the wrong directions. With these two idealists Denis found himself. He, too, was an idealist but younger than we. He had a joy in life—yes, and a fundamental belief in it—that made him see always a little ahead of him. He loved every moment, but especially he embraced the moments that were to be. It is this joy, this happiness of his, that I specially remember. Of course, he had his downcast moments, as we all had. The Revolution came upon us with a rock of the ground under our feet and a rumble of guns in our ears. Poor Propaganda Office! I remember that I had thought that it would be nice for the Russians to read Stevenson and Thomas Hardy. I had complete new sets of them in the office. Denis, too, liked the idea, for he had a passion for literature, but after that March afternoon when the carts with the rifles rattled past our office windows Stevenson and Hardy were, I fear, of little value.

But Denis didn't mind that. He was always for the next thing. The Allies were disappointing—they were not helping the Russians as they might. But what of that? They soon would.

Behind his joy and his optimism he had a deep wisdom. I have often thought of that since. He was made for a great future. His qualities of courage and optimism and common sense were just what was needed afterwards by a troubled world. He would have been, too, I think, a fine writer. Why was he cut off so soon? Only because that same courage and optimism led him always

30 I 17

Letter writing gets harder and harder these days. Chiefly because all one's thoughts and talk are always on the political situation here, which is like a kaleidoscope if you look at it in detail and absolutely unchanged if you regard it as a whole. The extraordinary thing is that there can hardly be a hundred reactionaries in the length and breadth of Russia. Everyone from Grand Dukes to one's sleigh driver all thunder against the régime. Conditions of life are awful. The only thing that's cheap is money. (By the by, I've told 'em at home that unless they raise my screw to £500 I can't possibly stay) Revolution must come, but whether now or after the war is hard to decide. However, any change must be for the good.

14 2.17

(1) The war simply doesn't exist here. Give them their circus and nobody seems to mind going without bread.

(2) I get on best with the sleigh drivers. I drove down the Nevski yesterday and took half an hour over it.

"Your horse goes slowly," I said. "She's tired?"

"No, your excellency, but I'm thinking—my horse too."

"What about?" Silence at first, then a jerk at the reins, full stop, and the driver leans back and whispers "There is a great untidiness in this country." On again, then another stop, then "Everywhere." On again, another stop, and "Even in the highest places." And so on, all down the Nevski. Russia beats me.

3.3.17

My own idea is that the reactionary class here is the most easily to be influenced, of all countries. They've never thought. That's the trouble. But they don't seem to have the same terror and suspicion of thought that one finds in the reactionaries of other countries. Thought has just not come their way.

The whole system must be changed, to effect any difference, and the people feel that they can't change the whole system in the middle of a war. Oddly enough the Government want a revolution which they believe they can put down and would give them an excuse for chucking this war against autocracy. The lack of everything is sheer "provocation." And the people starve and shiver and declare they won't rebel—now. And so the war goes on.

14 3.17 (*The March Revolution*)

Here's to let you know I'm still alive and well. The Revolution I think is over, and unless something unexpected happens it ought to be a great success.

I was away in Finland for the week-end. Shining all day long : magnificent weather, brilliant sun, ripping woods along the coast, and we went out skiing gaily over the sea towards Cronstadt with the snow glistening and glittering and the sky full of bits of rainbows I was staying with a Russian author fellow and his family, who were charming. On Monday I came back, arrived at the station, went to look for a sleigh and found a revolution Machine guns, Cossacks, crowds, odd shots crackling all round. I started to walk towards the town and wondered why no one molested me, though a jovial fellow found a machine gun and popped off down the street I was in. An officer I was walking with got stopped, while I passed on. A few women and old people joined me to cross the bridge that was strongly guarded. I couldn't make out what had happened till on the bridge I saw a red flag and realised I was among the revolted troops. A good deal of fighting was going on in the streets. However, I got through all right. Fighting went on all day. It's beastly, this street fighting. No one knows who is friend or foe. Shots whip past you from everywhere. Terribly disorganised firing. Troops collected all day and came over to the side of the Duma. At last the only resistance was made by the police who had machine guns in house tops and swept the streets—agents, provocatives, etc.

I'd just finished breakfast in my room yesterday at about a quarter to nine when some damned provocative people shot at the crowd from the top of the Astoria where I live. The troops promptly attacked the hotel and took it. We English took charge of the women and kids and fed 'em and kept 'em quiet and evacuated them all day at odd moments. I must say we were extraordinarily well treated by everyone. The place was so smashed up that we had to leave last night and cadge billets, but hope to get back tomorrow.

On the whole the whole show has been wonderfully well run, and as things look at present they are really hopeful. The old régime, I think, has gone and the moderation and quietness of the revolution is wonderful. No looting, no drunkenness to speak of. Rows go on, of course, as the police haven't all been routed out and there's a certain amount of firing all about but it's nothing like the last few

days Still, I'm pretty tired and must finish. Hope to get off a telegram tomorrow

20 3 17

(2) No one expected the Revolution, and the old professional Revolutionary (as one might almost call them) was the most surprised. It just came. The Government undoubtedly provoked it, hoping to turn its failure to their own strengthening and then with police and machine guns on every commanding place (28,000 police, paid 100 roubles a day, with 1,000 rouble bonus at the end) they felt sure of success. Yet within 3 days all was over, and only about 4,000 dead, most being police. We've had bad moments since then—but politically. I've been staying at the Embassy where they were simply charming, but last night I went back to the Astoria which is very cold, but home, it's rather like inhabiting a monastery in the war zone.

Petrograd is a most amusing place in its way, just now. Everyone bursting with liberty. Crowds everywhere talking hard—crowds on the Nevski—imagine that, O ye who in old days—a fortnight ago—hardly liked to speak with a pal in the street. Of course the bag is going after a fortnight's delay. I'm very well, very busy, but as fit as a flea.

24 3 17

Well, things are quiet enough now, though it's still an anxious time for us. The many-headed monster hasn't quite decided which is going to be the principal head, and as it is, all the heads are quarrelling.

It's a huge experiment in democracy and is very instructive and quite amusing. One thing I like about the Russian is he doesn't mind saying he's wrong. Also, he is quite ready to be convinced, which is a faculty we do not possess, not any of us. Now he's experimenting—hard, the war quite forgotten. Unless he's careful he'll take a nasty knock from Herr Hun, but one can't help feeling the tremendous importance the revolution has for him and how secondary the war must be for the moment. It'll take a lot to keep the nation up to war scratch. The Germans will probably do the trick, with their usual belief in frightfulness. I bet he attacks on this front although that's the only thing needed to get the Russians together.

7 4. 17

You can't imagine how busy I am these days. Revolutions are

upsetting things, especially as one's got to go on with a certain war. The happy Russ runs about all day waving blood-red banners with "War till Victory" written large on them but no one does anything else. Everyone spends all their time worrying about how they can get freer and freer. Nobody wants to do anything any more except just wander about and talk about their beloved freedom. Which is bad, unless something wakes 'em up.

13.5.17 (*The First Bolshevik attempt on Petrograd*)

(1) Things are about as settled here as on the top of a volcano. I believe the volcano has done erupting, but I'm in the microscopic minority. Agitators abound, and the voice of the fool alone is heard.

(2) This Russian show simply cannot be judged from England. Its hard enough to judge it here, but I believe most tremendously in the Russian. He's fickle—like all crowds—he's easily influenced, and the latest visionary gets him. He needs to grow up intellectually to get more stability in his ideas. But he wants, ye gods how he wants to get that stability.

(3) England is a fine show, and as I get fonder and fonder of Russia I'd give anything to see these two countries helping each other. For England needs Russia, just as much as Russia needs England. I'm beginning to feel that I shall settle here after the war. But you must come too, little people.

31.5.17

As it is, things are very critical here. The extreme Social Democrats, by their anarchy doctrine and stop-the-war, have discredited the Republic. There's a chance now of a counter-revolution and only an attack on this front will save the situation. It's a situation so tremendously worth saving. Everything I believe in, is bound up in this Revolution. So I'm working like the devil to help. I hope I'm right. Anyhow I believe I'm right. Its all a tremendous experience anyhow. And in this country really it's ridiculous to prophesy. Perhaps there won't be a counter-revolution—I pray not, as it would mean civil war. Still, in Russia the inevitable never happens.

I'm afraid I'm tired—tired as I've never been before. Meetings, committees, dinners with everyone who's doing something here, every day, every night. It's a ceaseless strain. One can't be detached. It's my life.



23 6.17

Prices have swooped away up into the blue Butter (if you can get it) is 10s. a pound The whole scheme of things has gone mad The country is bankrupt, the food supply has gone to pot, anarchy is everywhere, no one works, everyone demands enormous wages, there is a war on—and yet, though any of these things would ruin another country, Russia carries on, almost unmoved. The obvious solution would seem to be to stop the war—and like most obvious things would only accentuate matters

22 7.17 (*The second Bolshevik attempt on Petrograd*)

I wrote last Monday, full of vague uneasiness, then went home through quiet streets to dinner and wondered what was worrying me After dinner we were sitting talking over coffee when a lot of lorries drove past full of machine guns and red flags with "Down with the Ministers" written on them. A little while later and we heard firing, so went out to see the trouble. The Duma is only a few hundred yards away from our house, and there we found huge crowds, all demanding things like "bread," "Socialist ministers," "peace terms," etc., etc. I spent a couple of hours wandering from group to group asking what they really wanted No one knew. On the contrary they all wanted to know why they'd been called out with their arms and banners and vague complaints Soldiers rolled up in companies and batteries and joined in the demonstration, and from group to group went black-hatted black-visaged men, inciting the people. It was too like what one expected, to be convincing. One felt the Anarchists had got ideas as to their behaviour and dress from cartoons. They sneaked about and wouldn't argue with us, but just tried to incite and disappear. The extraordinary thing was the clamour of the people. Disorders spread all over the town and we were out till nearly 4 in the morning, but though in places, as on the Nevski, there was a lot of shooting, I never found a Russian who was anything but friendly and anxious to talk things over in a quiet way. They even helped me out in my Russian, when I was arguing against them. It made it all the more tragic, for things got worse and worse. The whole place was filled with the most damned lies, and the Bolsheviks (i.e. Leninites) were everywhere, stirring up trouble. By Tuesday morning the whole town was apparently in their hands and things looked all up. Then a sudden wave of good sense swept over the town. The Cossacks and one or two regiments remained unaffected and began to clear various quarters. At the end of the day, after a certain amount of

fighting, they had them swept out of this side of the river. Still, *force majeure* is no argument, and things looked still pretty bad. And then, luckily, the whole of Lenin's dealings with Germany were discovered and (eventually) published, and the tide turned, and now there's scarcely any fighting anywhere. Thank God. It's been a rotten show, especially as the Bolsheviks timed it to come off when the Cadet party cleared out of the Government on the Ukraine question. I had information (but no proofs) a week before, that the Germans were working that little Russian (?) Autonomy show, and now it's proved. Gad, they are devils.

July 1917

The war caused the revolution—the greatest thing in the history of our times—the finest thing. The Revolution has raised the level of the war and of our ideals, and restrained all tendency to imperialism, so that the ideals we began to fight for, and forgot, have become our declared peace terms—universal democracy.

*No date*

Some man, too, will rise perhaps and be a nation's saviour, but he'll only be stepping on Kerensky's shoulders. Poor Kerensky. They expected him to be ready-made, with ideas ready-made, and he's been going along the road like the rest of us.

1.10.17

The autumn is coming on pretty fast and despite all the troubles and alarms the winter life of P'grad is beginning. I went to the Ballet the other night. It was rather sad. Strange people were in all the boxes. Soldiers sprawled about the Theatre. Everyone felt out of place. And that is the general impression I get about everything. Russia is being run by amateurs, who ape the manners of the *ci-devant* rulers. One must just have patience.

18.11.17 (*The Bolshevik Revolution*)

The Petrograd news, too, was bad, so as soon as I could I bolted back—a slow thing in bolts, for our train was always being held up, but at last the news came in that Kerensky had captured P'grad and we pushed on. As we passed the scene of his supposed victory, I looked out and saw nothing, but never doubted, for the train rushed on, and then I arrived and found the town quite cut off. By means of some comedy, we'd been sent right through, and here I am.

The Lord knows what'll happen. Things are pretty bad, but life goes on just the same. O, but it's so interesting, this life here. I couldn't drop it now.

23.II.I7

If we, allies, had only definitely stated our terms, this situation would have been impossible.

27.II.I7

I went out sledging last night across the city, in the moonlight and the deep snow. It was the most perfect night. All the palaces and churches shining white against the dark blue sky. Brilliant white streets, old orange or red buildings, dark shadows, golden spires or domes. The river crunching with ice floes, sailing down from Ladoga, and at all the bridges and street corners little groups of soldiers sitting round their fires.

It's hard then to think of the bitterness and the stupid outbursts, and the brutalities that go on. So hard that one doesn't. I live the same life I've lived for over a year now—very quiet, very ordered, yet anything but dull.

8.I2.I7

It's a funny old position. The Bolsheviks are nominally at the head of affairs, but in reality it's mob law—in which the mob is there but not the law. The B's pass law after law, all destroying the existent state of affairs and not one constructive one. They hadn't even considered how to make peace. The only Bourgeois (everything vile is "Bourgeois" here) Powers they attack are those of their allies. Never a word against Germany. German is spoken at the Smolny—the B's headquarters. Ramsay MacDonald and Co. are their only English "Comrades." We are dirt. And yet I really believe that Lenin means well—in his extraordinary way. He certainly uses German money and Germans, and they use him, and for the moment both are satisfied.

But the whole thing is as capricious a bit of *force majeure* as ever existed. The triumph of force in the hands of the Jew. For not even the Bolsheviks, as a whole, approve of the Smolny crowd. They are splitting, and the malcontents join the great mass of the land. I expect the papers call this a reign of terror. You hear the words often enough nowadays. To me it seems a reign of apathy. People just refuse to care and drift about, much as ever. The soldiers got drunk—and appallingly drunk—at the Winter Palace

the other night and had a blaze away at everything within range. They haven't got over the effects yet, and our street, where usually none but Grand Dukes and millionaires live, smells of drink, and lousy soldiers, and echoes with old bullets. This sounds terrible, but it isn't in the least. People come to dinner at night. One goes shopping as usual, except that prices are fantastic, and you stand a chance of being robbed directly you've bought anything, held up in the highwayman style in the middle of the Nevsky. Everyone tells you what a disgrace it is, but no one does anything. One hopes it will just wear itself out. But then, who's next? The Bolsheviks rule on the idea that anything the masses want they must have, but the masses are notoriously acquiescent. They want very little that means a change. Besides, they have a mistrust (which rich folk have not) of getting something for nothing. So the few bold spirits plunge merrily and play hell. And Trotsky and Lenin, hating the bourgeoisie more and more every day, issue new edicts destroying everything, repudiating debts, marriages, murders, alliances, enemy crimes—oh, they're having a great time. (Trotsky with a fine sense of humour discovers that there's some Russian Jew interned in England and appoints him Ambassador to the Court of St. James), or Lenin gets a fellow who last year was a secret police agent, before that a brigand, makes him a Colonel, though he'd abolished all promotions, and sends him on the job of making peace. The whole established world is screaming rage at the pair, but they sit and chortle and concoct more frightfulness against the bourgeois. But the "bourjoy" remains the same as ever, though terrified. Technically speaking nothing exists in Russia, neither capital—nor labour, wealth—nor poverty, war—nor peace. Yet everything's the same, only more so, as ever it was. The only trouble is the future. The B's have had an easy time. There's been plenty of fault to find and they found it, and so gave the impression, as those people do, in a negative way, of being better than the last régime. But they can't possibly last. And then who? I'm all for the Social Revolutionaries, but reactions don't usually go that way. They go whole hog, and I'm terrified of that happening, especially as the Hun, who's only job is to keep this land at unrest, is playing the counter-revolutionary game, as hard as he can. And then—? Well, it hasn't happened yet, so what's the worry?

(2) It was snowing fitfully and the wind cutting like a knife, and as I stumbled along I looked up and saw a rabble coming towards me. In front were Cossacks, on little incredibly woolly ponies, rifles over their shoulders, unkempt, dirty, unshaven, behind

them a crowd of men shuffling along with fixed bayonets, and then a herd of Caucasian buffaloes, great gaunt beasts with long winding horns, and shaggy hides—then sleighs carrying hay and tents and bits of camp furniture and more mounted Cossacks. You'd have said it was hundreds of years ago and they were nomad tribes. I asked a Cossack what they were doing. "We're moving from the Front" he said. "And where to?" I asked. "Oh, Tchort znaet—the devil knows" he went on.

Dec. 1917

At about one a few of us went on to the Americans who were giving a dance, and stayed there till about two. The Yanks gave their show in the National City Bank (late Turkish Embassy) and at about half past one a party of ruffians, armed to the teeth, calling themselves the Red Guard, burst in to take over the funds, etc. They were a goodly band of cut-throats, and looked alarming for a minute. And so we stood, staring at each other across the marble halls, until suddenly the bandits began to grow bashful and looking very nervous and ill at ease amongst the gaiety, gradually melted away, mumbling excuses.

Germany has backed up the Bolsheviks, and the B's have returned the compliment. But I wonder how Germany will stand the results of this hob-nobbing after the war. I feel that there'll be such a bust up when peace breaks out, that nothing one arranges now will hold good. These social ideas must sweep through Europe. Already we here, against our will, acquiesce in much that 6 months ago horrified us. I feel I've been dragged like a tin can tied to the tail of this Socialism—and consequently am very jumbled up.

*No date*

Until this Bolshevik bubble breaks, I don't know how I'm going to get letters home to you. However I suppose the bubble will burst one day. It's too fantastic to be lasting. And then I think we'll miss Trotsky's daily surprise packet. So far he's chucked a bomb every day. They say he thinks of them himself. But the pro-Germans here assert that the 5 German Staff Officers at the Smolny have a lot to do with it.

Anyhow everyone's very fond of Trotsky. He's ruining Russia but with a great sense of humour, which is better than the melodramatic seriousness of Kerensky. And Lenin gurgles in the background. One feels they're having a glorious run for their(?) money.

## 6.1.18

Tomorrow is Russian Xmas but a bad day for us as there's a general exodus. The Buchanans, Military Attachés, Scale, Neilson, Admiral Stanley (who lives in the flat above me) and other officers. H.E. is just played out. The poor old man has been wonderful all these years, but lately he's begun to get too hopelessly worn out and is going home for a rest. The others are clearing for various reasons which I think is a pity, and myself have decided to stay on, as I really feel every Englishman here can help, if only by just being here and keeping optimistic.

I myself expect to be off again in a few days on a most extremely interesting trip. I've spent too long at this game to chuck it, and I suppose my knowledge is worth something. Anyhow a new man would take a huge time picking it up, and time is so dreadfully important. But it's rotten to think that so few of us will be left. One thinks and dreams of nothing but coming home.

(2) On paper the situation is chaotic beyond description and I'm afraid you only hear the melodramatic side of it all in England. But really what always astonishes me is the quiet way we all manage to live. You mustn't get anxious about me, please, even though you mayn't hear of me for some time.

18.1.18 (*Dissolution of the Constituent Assembly*)

So they're at it again, just like so many times in the last 10 months, only now the Red Guard are on the housetops firing and the proletariats are getting it in the neck. *Plus ça change, plus c'est la même chose.* If you look at what the Bolsheviks want to do, you feel sympathetic, but if you see what they've done, you're dead against them. Personally I feel that they're the only anti-German (among other anti's) party in Russia and are out to smash Imperialism, but they've smashed the country so completely that they have no leverage to work with. Of course Petrograd is not a good place to judge from, but there are places even worse. The roads are in a terrible state. The snow hasn't been cleared anywhere, and the Nevsky is like a country track, all rutted and vallied, so that driving down it is like a Scenic Railway. Trams seldom run, the streets are lighted worse and worse, people get robbed anywhere even in daylight, prices are fabulous, we are sitting in the office in our great-coats, and meagre oil lamps. Little light, little heating, unemployment everywhere, starvation, no transport, murders of the bourgeois, anarchy. Trade absolutely stopped.

19.1.18

(Harold) Williams just come in. He was at Constituent Assembly last night and is disgusted. Machine guns in the galleries. Everyone howling the other down. Cat-calls, general hubbub and eventually the soldiers and sailors cleared the hall. Wherefore, I am not a Bolshevik.

On the other hand their ideas and actions may give peace to us and the only real possible peace, without annexation and indemnities, and a general self-expression of peoples. Wherefore, if it comes off, I shall be truly and eternally grateful. But Russia will be the prey of Germany and that makes me utterly miserable.

2.2.18

I agree with nearly everything. I think the Allies' policy with regard to Russia has been not only despicable but idiotic. Thank God, it's not been the fault of us here. Russia, achieving that which we say we are fighting for, should have some other reward and help than mere encouragement to go on fighting. Big men at home might have seen beyond their damned jingoism and turned the Revolution to great account.

However our mandarins have failed. And while it's heart-breaking for us out here I'm glad in a way, for it means that we'll have such an overwhelming case against them when the war is over that we will be able to get rid of them without much difficulty. We are all revolutionaries here. But—what of Germany?

(2) Idealism seems to be crushed out of them. They are poor "dark" people, acquiescing for the time, utterly conscious of their weakness, ready to acquiesce in any new state that will bring order. Disorder, growing since the beginning of the war, is now appalling. But the mass of the people are inert. If they can be fed, all will go well. But we're in a very bad way now. Stark hunger will make them welcome any tyranny—and England is indifferent, because Russia won't go on with the war—Lenin believes in complete and utter anarchy, and when he thinks the country is ready for it will let it go, and turn his attention elsewhere.

(3) Trotsky, too, feels that they are paving the way to counter-revolution. Hence his split (scarcely concealed) with Lenin. Whatever happens in P'grad radiates throughout Russia, slowly but irrevocably, and now although the Smolny are weakening here, the old impulse of Bolshevism is sweeping more and more into the distance, carrying away the Rada, and, I believe, Kaledin. It's nonsense to say P'grad isn't Russia. It's a prophecy of Russia.

You're a fool to march on P'grad. It's the past marching on the future.

(4) The people are dazed, sick and tired, and seem to have no emotion, political, national, or human, left in them. Political parties rage over their heads and the people wish they wouldn't. Anything for peace and land. But the greatest opponent of the land nationalisation is the peasant, who wants his neighbour's land, but not new territory far away.

14.2.18 (*A visit to Madame Kollontay*)

I told you what the P'grad streets were like. Several feet of snow trampled to the solidity of ice. And then thaw, and Petrograd becomes a morass. On the Nevski even I went in over my knees in water. So life became even more primitive. Now everyone is put on to clear the new fall of snow. Everyone—officers, bourgeois, aristos, financiers, everyone. And my turn will probably come. It's funny living absolutely without privilege of security. Heaps of my friends have been held up, robbed, even of their clothes, and return home in their shirts. Which wouldn't be so bad in summer, but now is hardly recommended. So we all go armed.

I went and called on Kolontai the other day. She's the romantic figure of the Revolution. The widow of a General, she has the reputation of being young, beautiful, fascinating, and is one of the chief leaders of the Bolsheviks. I expected very much the Sasha Kropotkin style of woman, but found a little quiet woman in an untidy dark flat, full of Bolsheviks. The only room in which we could talk was a tiny bedroom (smaller than the night nursery at home). She sat on the bed, that had a hideous Bulgarian anti-macassar sort of counterpane on it, and waited, with her hands folded on her knees, staring gently at me, for me to explain what I wanted. I had someone to introduce me, of course, but even so it wasn't easy. So I told her why I disagreed with Bolshevism, and asked her, as one propagandist to another, to explain many things. She was charming. She isn't pretty and she isn't young, but she bowled me over. Awfully simple and (I felt) frank, and an idealist—(Sasha tells me I'm quite wrong, but doesn't shake my faith). Point by point she answered everything—which was extremely good of her, and though she didn't convince me that she was right, I believed in her sincerity, which is what I really wanted, and I only wished I had been able to get that point of view before. They won't last very long, she does not even expect it herself, but they think that by destroying everything rotten in the country (finance, classes, mili-



tarism, ignorance) they will leave Russia in a better state, even if ruined, and a mass of fighting peoples. I don't agree, but I see their vision. You cannot conceive the appalling state of anarchy and disorganisation the country is in. But, say they, out of all the present bloodiness something great will come. I wonder. Russia is capable of anything—bad or good. Anyhow we parted good friends, and I was to have seen her again and often, she said, but she's suddenly been whisked off to England. I talked to her for about an hour and a half—and you can imagine how shocked is bourgeois Petrograd. I, a British cavalry captain (by the by I'm Captain Garstin these days) to talk with a Bolshevik commissar, and to admire her—shades of the Great War.

8.3.18

It's interesting to see how the Bolshevik principle is sinking into people's heads here. They made the great mistake of coming here under German protection, playing what was then the German interest. The world being as it is, I still feel they let us all down immensely, but now they are surely above suspicion. They are attacking German militarism in the surest way. People here are realising it—and elsewhere I think.

2.4.18

I wrote last, after all the British had bolted from Petrograd and we were waiting to follow the Bolshevik Government to Moscow. Trotsky suddenly told us one day he was going the next morning, so we packed in a hurry and travelled down with him. I told you in my last letter what my first impressions were of him, and I said I think there was something in the man that baffled me. I think, now, it baffles Trotters just as much. It is, I feel, a sort of vision in the fellow, that comes out in his wonderful speeches, but not in reality. It is always worrying him, and it's queer to watch him forcing it out of his mind while he talks facts and details to us. He is enormously ambitious, I am sure, but honest, with a clear-seeing brain, as far as spotting flaws in the existent goes. But he has none of Lenin's supreme detachment.

4.4.18 (*A sketch of Trotsky*)

I see a fair amount now of all the birds who rule the roost here. Trotsky, Kolontai and the like. They admit they staked all on the German being like the rest of us, desirous of peace, if given a decent excuse. So now they have gone on to the other extreme and hate

Germans even more than I do—at least they seem to. Trotters is a funny old bird—an eagle, to be correct. As a rule nowadays, he's a bit broody and sits hunched up, quiet, and with only his eyes moving, his head swaying slightly. He's quite pleasant and gentle. Then something moves him, his eye flashes, the tufts of beard and imperial and his shocks of hair all flutter up, his hooky beak of a nose beaks more than ever, his mouth opens with the suddenness of a bird's and out comes a torrent of words, then he relapses and gets broody again. Opinions of him vary, some believe he's the "greatest Jew since Christ," others that he'd "do Iscariot out of a job," both of these are American summaries of opinion. I believe he's got a very ordinary capability for most things, but a wonderful instinct for seeing the spots in the ordered state. Anything that's taken for granted is wrong. It's a simple formula, but Trotters carries it out with great effect.

All the Bolsheviks intended to do was to destroy, then to depart, and hoped that what was built up would not be so bad as the show they pulled down. But no one has risen against them, and so they've had to start constructing themselves. So far they've just sat and gasped at the task. Every few minutes they change into new ministries and hope they'll get inspiration while in process of demenagement. But it doesn't come, and now they've got to settle down to hard work, they must—this bout of work may be the salvation of Russia. I'm a lazy kind of ass myself, but the Russian beats me stiff. And the Bolshevik, except when he's a Jew, is as good a Russian as anyone else.

*Received 6.8.18*

"The Bolsheviks" said a peasant to me yesterday "promised us bread and peace. They gave us a shameful peace and have taken away our bread." This, of course, is said every day, and would mean nothing in the Russia of a year ago. But although, technically, the Revolution is over (I believe) and reaction is setting in, the Revolutions and especially the Bolsheviks have taught the people to think. Kolontai told me that two months ago, and I didn't believe her.

(2) It's a fierce tangle. But so much is clear :—

1. The People are starving.
2. The Bolsheviks are losing power daily.
3. The help needed cannot be expected from Germany.
4. The German monarchists are losing credit.
5. In despair a Russian National spirit is being created.

(3) I don't know how long I shall stay on. The next few weeks will decide. Anyhow I've played my part, and am content to leave it to a better man.

(No date)

Well, what is there to say? God, knowing the past and the future, looks down on Russia, and perhaps says "All is well" and the angel hosts trumpet it forth—or perhaps He says "All is na poo" and the angels, who have little originality, sing "Na Poo," till God gives them something else to say. However I'm sure that He's the only person with any idea.

(2) Every possible disaster has threatened us, but nothing comes. The inevitable never happens—because we have a fixed idea of the inevitable. For instance during the Miliukoff crises I met thousands of people armed to the teeth, shouting and roaring down the street "Long live Anarchy, (or Lenin). Down with Miliukoff." Then I heard another storm of cheering and saw coming up the street thousands of people armed to the teeth, shouting and roaring "Down with Anarchy (or Lenin). Long live Miliukoff." Now we've been brought up on the axiom that when two bodies propelled from opposite directions meet, there is a collision. In Russia there is no collision. They each took their side of the road, brandished their fire arms and cutlery at the nearest sidewalk and continued to hurl menaces—and so passed on. Now I ask you, how can you describe a people like that?

*Received 17.8.18 (A picture of Lenin)*

I remember sitting down in Moscow and telling you about Lenin at the big congress there. That letter, of course, never went, for the congress, in my mind, seems the beginning of it all. Lenin struck me as the biggest force I've ever felt in my life. The Big Theatre, the third finest in the world, they say, where I used to go to see the ballets, was crammed with the Bolsheviks and Left Soc. Revs.—a mob of intellectual hooligans, chinless, long-haired, dreamers or thorough-going rascals. We were given the big box near the stage, with the Boche above us, which was a pity, as we couldn't watch him when the Left S.R.'s got a bit of anti-German hate off their chests. They certainly had the right instincts, those S.R.'s, but no discipline. Poor Spiridonova, like a prim ineffectual schoolmistress, tried to keep her people in order, but they broke loose all over the place, and stormed against the Bolshevik and the Boche

at every chance. The odd thing was that the Bolshes stood firm, although they look, and are, a far more raggle-taggle crowd than the others. One wondered what kept 'em good. Certainly not Trotsky, who flares up, snaps and sees red whenever he is annoyed, which is fairly often. His speeches are all invective and oratory. But on the second day, when Spiridonova, more like a school marm than ever, emphasising every sixth word with a monotonous gesture, as though hitting a non-existent table, was lecturing the rough crowd with a discourse on the products and by-products of Bolshevism, and everyone was bored or angry or peevish, on to the stage with a happy smile all round, rubbing his hands, nicely dressed and conspicuously clean, comes Lenin. If you take the usual picture of Shakespeare and bring it to life by putting a smile of cynicism into it—you have Lenin, at first sight. You know the tag about life being a comedy and those who think, etc. Well, Lenin's essentially the thinker. He saw comedy in everything. Spiridonova's speech tickled him at once. His little eyes twinkled, he applauded her attacks on himself perfectly good-humouredly, prodded Trotsky for getting angry, laughed, tried to get everyone to see the humour of it all, and fairly laughed at everyone, it seemed, for being so obtuse. I can see him now pursing up his mouth and dimpling in the efforts to keep from laughing at a conclusion he feels is coming, and then, when it inevitably comes, bursting with joy of its absurdity.

He spoke simply, no rhetoric, no bouquet. They tried to heckle him and he over-rode it all. He stated his own grim philosophy in his own satirical way. He was above the crowd, above us all, not caring a damn whether everyone present was starving or not (which of course they weren't), seeing nothing of the present time except as it bears on the future—he might have been an intellectual professor smiling at the effect of drink on a population of ants—smiling so kindly, as if inviting them to observe the ludicrousness. That's one impression. Another, as you follow his short direct sentences, is of adventure. He is, anyhow, a debonair adventurer. His hand is against the whole world, Emperors and Mandarins his especial quarry. Against his account are the deaths of thousands, the misery of nearly all Russia, but he believes he is saving Russia, and takes no heed of what is happening, but laughs from perspective of the future. Well, that's his business, but I'm told he sleeps eight hours every night.

(2) "The town is quiet" quoth I. The driver sniffed derisively at me. "Very quiet," he said, "we are all dying, that's how it is."

8.6 18 (*Russia and Home*)

Of course I'm getting stale. I feel I shall spend my life between home and Russia, God knows why. I speak the language extraordinarily badly, I hate, yes hate, the average upper class Russian, have been damnably disappointed in all I've tried to do out here, have had chance after chance and seen all swept away by that ruthless fate that seems to dwell in these wide lands and twist the little schemes and hopes of man into malignant shapes, or else wipe them bewilderingly right away. But it's perhaps for this reason that I shall never be able wholly, or even partially, to wipe Russia out of my life. Anyhow, whatever I shall feel when I do get home, now it's home, home, home, for me at the first chance.

## 21.6.18

I went to a house the other day where a girl told me her father was arrested, and her brother-in-law and fiancé, all on a trumped-up charge of counter-revolutionary plots. "Oh," but I laughed, "they can't hurt them," for they were persons I knew. "You can't tell," said the girl, "for you see I've just heard today, that they've killed my brother." And this is taken perfectly calmly, so much so that when that very afternoon, while we were talking, her father was released and came back, and the mother did a very conventional fainting act, everyone felt that this was hardly the time for showing so much emotion. Drama must be kept for undramatic seasons. Now, in self-protection, one must be dull. Everyone feels that the Bolshevik régime is ending, and that, I suppose, means another revolution. But nobody knows what they want. They never do. They don't want what they've got, but neither did they in the days of Nicholas II, or Kerensky. Its revolution with a vengeance. But one gets weary of the vengeance part of it.

## LITHUANIA: THE FIRST TWENTY YEARS

IN the life of a nation twenty years of freedom is only a brief period ; but during that interval of independence the Lithuanian people have succeeded in accomplishing so much in all spheres of their activity that to talk about these achievements affords every Lithuanian genuine satisfaction. The first two decades of liberty have proved to all in concrete form that the Lithuanian nation was worthy of freedom. Moreover, thanks to that freedom it has done much for its culture, its internal economy and, generally, for the well-being of the population of the country. It has worthily passed the examination of independence ; and with great courage, and with even greater self-reliance, it is now moving onwards into further decades of freedom, fervently believing that it will survive the centuries.

Only one who has known Lithuania in the past, before the recovery of freedom, can justly appraise its progress. The Lithuanians themselves, who well remember the not so distant past—twenty or thirty years ago—sometimes find it hard today to believe that such progress has been made during two decades of independence. Let us remember that during more than a hundred years every kind of Lithuanian State emblem had been destroyed, that she was only a small part of the Russian Empire, and without any freedom. Let us remember that from 1864 until 1904 the Lithuanian Press was prohibited—not only newspapers but even prayer-books in the Lithuanian language. During those years of total darkness not only Lithuanian culture and popular education were retarded, but any national idea was for Lithuanians out of the question. The greatest danger of extinction threatened the people. For a word spoken or printed in Lithuanian thousands of persons ended their days in Siberia. However, the will to live overcame all those obstacles. When, after the Great War, the time of national freedom arrived, the Lithuanians were ready to claim it, and they restored their independent State by their own efforts.

### I.

The labour of reconstructing this independence was very difficult. In 1918 a German military administration ruled in Lithuania. Until the last days of the war Germany dreamed of a permanent domicile in the country. Grandiose plans were prepared to eject Lithuanians, and to settle Germans on the land.

It goes without saying that the Germans would have accomplished this if they could have held the Western front against the Allies. The overthrow of the Russian Empire and the destruction of the might of Germany on the Western front were therefore the primary, indispensable conditions for Lithuania's recovery of liberty. Yet even these two historical conditions would not have sufficed had not the common people's love of freedom and their determination to possess their own national State been applied to the arduous labour of reconstruction.

On leaving Lithuania the Germans left nothing but ruin behind. The land was exhausted by requisitions for German military needs. The Lithuanians possessed neither their own army nor weapons. Neither the Russians nor the Germans had permitted them to organise and arm, so that the end of 1918 and the beginning of 1919 were highly critical periods for the nation. When the Germans left the country they were followed by the Russian Bolsheviks, who wished again to enslave the Lithuanian people. But the Lithuanians were thoroughly resolved, and at the very beginning of 1919 they hastened to summon volunteers to the army. Recruits thus called up by a provisional Government began in large numbers and of their own free will to join the first organised regiments. In this manner were created the early volunteer units, which after a hurried training were at once sent to the front. Gradually they began to drive the new invaders from the country. The struggle was a difficult one, because the Lithuanians were far outnumbered by the Bolsheviks, and worse armed. Yet throughout 1919 encounters went on between the young Lithuanian army and the Bolshevik invaders, to the advantage of the former. The entire ethnographic territory was cleared of the Bolshevik army. Lithuania then opened peace negotiations with Moscow which led to a peace treaty in July, 1920. By this treaty Moscow recognised the free, independent State of Lithuania, and thus was gained the first great step forward to liberty.

But more struggles were in store with other enemies of this newly gained freedom. First of all, certain German divisions had been left behind in the Baltic countries, ostensibly to make war on the Bolsheviks, and commanded by a former Russian officer, Bermont-Avalov. This well-armed German force, proclaiming itself a Russian unit, created a grave danger for Lithuania and the other Baltic States, because it had occupied large parts of territory and wholly refused to recognise the national Governments of Lithuania and Latvia. Only after the joint Lithuanian and Latvian armies had

routed these German-Russian divisions, and the Allied Missions had arranged for their gradual withdrawal from the two countries, was this foe "liquidated" in the autumn of 1919.

Nevertheless, the Lithuanians were still destined to fight. This time Poland had penetrated far into Lithuanian territory and had occupied the ancient capital, Vilna. Only at the end of 1920 did sanguinary struggles cease on Lithuanian territory. And only on the cessation of warfare in the field was it possible to enter upon other urgent tasks of State reconstruction in economic, cultural and other domains.

At first great difficulties were encountered in all spheres. The country lacked experienced officials for administrative work. It did not possess its own money. The former Russian roubles and the German marks introduced during the war had hopelessly depreciated as the result of unprecedented inflation in both cases. All the savings of the Lithuanian people had virtually ceased to exist. It was necessary to start from the ground upward, as the saying goes, and naturally much money was needed to make this start. At the time it was out of the question to think of a loan for the young State, which had not yet been recognised *de jure* by all the Powers. Nevertheless, many Lithuanian emigrants in America at this time came to the help of their old homeland. In America numerous subscriptions were collected, and formed the first loans. Furthermore the Lithuanian Government itself soon introduced its own national coinage—the litas—which has remained to this day the sole undepreciated coinage based on gold in the entire world.

## II.

The painful wounds of war began slowly to heal, the State administration was to some extent put in order and Lithuania set about the immense task of regulating the national economy, and organising its cultural life.

Being a small nation and State, the Lithuanians well realised that the most important guarantee of freedom must first of all be the cultural understanding of the people, the enlightenment of its inhabitants, and generally the creation of social well-being. For that reason, from the very outset, the closest attention was devoted to learning and national education. During pre-war times the majority of the schools in Lithuania had been Russian; and there were very few even of these, scarcely 20 per cent. of the absolutely necessary number. Consequently not many children had been able to obtain an elementary education. Many were quite illiterate,



## LITHUANIA: THE FIRST TWENTY YEARS. 609

unable to read or write. It is true that children were secretly taught in their homes to read in Lithuanian. This form of instruction was, however, quite inadequate and, moreover, in the eyes of the Russian administration, illegal. In all the territory covered by present-day Lithuania there were no more than 600 Russian government schools, and the number of pupils in them was correspondingly small. Today, on the other hand, statistics show the following figures: elementary schools over 5,300, secondary schools over 100, Higher Schools 7. There are over 300,000 pupils in the elementary schools; about 30,000 in the secondary schools, and over 4,000 students in the Higher Schools. These figures already say much for the degree of education of the Lithuanian population in the days of independence. Bearing in mind that in pre-war times the number of pupils or students of High Schools was only about 350 or 400, and that the number of pupils of secondary schools was also only a fraction of what it is today, it becomes clear that education in these days of freedom has risen about five-fold. Such an advance during so short a period has been possible only thanks to political independence. It is also proof of what Lithuania has done for her people in this one sphere alone. Yet in other domains of life just as much has been done during the same two decades.

Let us take the sphere of economics. Lithuania has always been an agricultural country, but while within the bounds of the Russian Empire she could not greatly improve her agriculture. It was hard for the Lithuanian farmer to compete with Ukrainian wheat, or with the livestock of the spacious Russian steppes. It was the export of horses to Germany before the war that afforded the Lithuanian farmers their principal source of revenue. Generally speaking, agriculture was fairly primitive at that time. Hardly anybody in the country had the remotest conception of rational stock-raising or of butter export before independence came. Only after the recovery of freedom did the nation feel the necessity and advantage of reorganising its agriculture. Butter production for export was first seriously inaugurated in the beginning of 1925-26. In 1927 bacon manufacture for export was started, and in these spheres important results have been achieved, which may be illustrated by the following comparative figures. Before the war there was not a single modern dairy in Lithuania, whereas today there are about 200 up-to-date dairies which annually produce about 20,000 tons of first-grade butter for export only. They use for this purpose 500 million litres of milk. Before the war there was

no butter export whatever from Lithuania. Today this industry constitutes a very important branch of her foreign trade.

A second comparatively new and important sphere of agricultural production is pig-breeding and bacon export. This branch began to be more intensively organised only in 1927; but with amazing rapidity the Lithuanian farmers learnt to breed good pedigree pigs suitable for bacon. Five large plants have been built to produce this commodity, and a staff of veterinary supervisors and bacon experts has been trained. Lithuanian bacon speedily won recognition on the English market and has become one of the most important items of export. The new State could, of course, easily expand its bacon production several times over, if a market for it were guaranteed; but the present figures are already comparatively large and count for a great deal in Lithuania's foreign trade.

As an agricultural country the new republic is greatly dependent on foreign countries in its exchange of trade. Latterly it has been compelled to conduct its foreign trade more and more on the principle *do ut des*, which means trying to equalise its trade balance with other countries. This matter has already been happily regulated.

In recent years at least half Lithuania's foreign trade has been conducted with England. The English market is very important and convenient, and with England Lithuania conducts its trade as far as possible on a compensatory basis. It sells to England its butter, bacon, eggs and certain timber materials. From England it buys coal, metal wares, textiles, salt, etc. Lithuania's foreign trade turnover is increasing annually. True, after the good years of 1928-1930 trade somewhat declined, but in recent years it has gradually improved. Exports are approximately even with imports, and both in recent years have again exceeded 200,000,000 litas, i.e. about seven or eight million pounds sterling. The statistics for 1938 give the value of exports as 233,000,000 litas and of imports 223,000,000 litas. For 1937 the corresponding figures were 206,000,000 and 212,000,000. The increase of exports is appraised as an indication that Lithuanian economic life as a whole is gaining strength.

The State financial policy has always been characterised by great caution, and the resolve to balance expenditure and revenue. For the most part the Government has succeeded in balancing the Budget without a deficit. In the good years 1928-1930 the State revenue considerably exceeded expenditures. In this manner there was created a special surplus, which was assigned to reserves to equalise the Budget in less favourable financial years. In recent

## LITHUANIA: THE FIRST TWENTY YEARS. 611

years revenue and expenditure have been somewhat larger than 300,000,000 litas—about £11,000,000. Last year they reached 350,000,000 litas, and this year they are even larger. As has already been stated, the Government pursues a very cautious financial policy. For that reason, so far the State has quite a small national debt; in all only about 75,000,000 litas of foreign debt and about 40,000,000 litas of internal debt. Thus the *per capita* debt is about 50 litas—that is, less than £2. Such positive achievements during twenty years of independence are thus seen to be due chiefly to the nation's own efforts.

Undoubtedly much more would have been done in various economic and cultural spheres if Lithuania had not been drawn into the unhappy armaments competition along with other European countries today. For some years she has been obliged to assign large sums for national defence from her small budget. It goes without saying that this fact reacts very painfully on all other important economic and cultural interests. But here Lithuania is least of all to blame. Desiring only to defend her freedom, she is compelled to incur colossal expenditures for military purposes. In recent years not less than 30 per cent. of all outlays have been expended on the needs of national defence. This is a very heavy burden, which the entire country feels. If it had not been for such disbursements for unproductive purposes, Lithuania would have already succeeded in so fundamentally changing the aspect of the country, and in so transforming her roads and hamlets that today she would have caught up with the most civilised lands of Western Europe. The national leaders have not, however, lost hope of seeing brighter days. In matters of finance the Government of the Republic continues to adhere to a conservative policy. It is doing everything in its power to render even this financial burden bearable for its people.

### III.

The political life of the new Lithuania has gone its own way. At the very beginning democratic principles were everywhere emphasised. All political parties proclaimed themselves democratic. The freedom of the nation was the common dogma of all. For political organisation models were sought chiefly in the democratic Western States, especially in France and Weimar Germany. Entire freedom for political campaigns during parliamentary elections, and entire freedom to organise political parties and groups, were not only theoretically recognised, but practically realised.

The Constitution of the Republic, which was adopted by the Constituent Assembly in the summer of 1922, guaranteed not only political but also civil liberties. The country went the way of Liberal Parliamentaryism. Nobody even dreamt of any other form of political order.

But with the lapse of time the young Parliament did not escape the errors of this doctrine. Free political agitation often degenerated into political demagogy. This demagogy used to manifest itself not only during electoral agitation but also after the elections in parliamentary work itself. Many political groups sprang up which were distinguished from one another not so much by the principles of their programmes as by their methods of demagogy. In Parliament there were formed not far short of a dozen separate factions, with their own special interests. Thanks to this state of affairs it became very difficult to secure a permanent majority supporting the Government, while political demagogy further discredited parliamentary authority in the eyes of the country. For that reason nobody in Lithuania despaired or grieved very much when on the 17 December, 1926, the forces of the Kaunas garrison, inspired by national and patriotic feelings, effected a political *coup d'état* directed against the left-wing majority of the moment and the left-wing Government supported by it.

This political revolution was a reaction against the demagogy of young parliamentarism and against governmental instability. It was believed that Lithuania should reform her political order, and should also reform her Constitution in the sense that parliamentary rights in the guidance of the State must be curtailed in the interests of good government. Nevertheless, it was not desired to renounce the principles of democratic administration. The spirit of the Lithuanian nation has always been very democratic, and a liberal form of administration suits it best. This fact was well understood by M. Antanas Smetona, who was the first President of the new State, and to whom, on 17 December, 1926, the army entrusted the political helm. He was well aware that Lithuania's political life needed a reform which would guarantee it greater stability and protect it from unhealthy demagogy. Under his guidance the country was gradually directed on the path of such reform. It amended its Republican Constitution in the sense that the presidential rights and prerogatives were greatly strengthened and parliamentary rights curtailed, leaving to Parliament rather functions of control of State administration. The franchise laws were also amended in conformity with the new political conceptions.

## LITHUANIA: THE FIRST TWENTY YEARS. 613

It is true that when in several larger and smaller European countries the principles of the authoritarian State gained the upper hand, in Lithuania also attempts were made to pursue more or less the same course. These were, however, more of a theoretical than of a practical nature. Only after certain legal enactments has Lithuania during recent years shown some similarity to countries with authoritarian régimes. In practice, however, under the present régime, Lithuania remains a democratically administered State. The people are very conscious of their national collective freedom, but they are also deeply attached to the individual liberty of the citizen. The present moment, too, is important for the political organisation of the country, and Lithuanian statesmen are not unmindful of this fact. They know that greater political pressure would not only be harmful to the nation but that it could not endure. In practice, therefore, the present-day so-called authoritarian régime differs considerably from similarly designated régimes in other countries. The democratic instincts of the people are very keen, and the Government reckons with this, so that the present régime, though styled authoritarian, is essentially human. This quality has been particularly noticeable since M. Vladas Mironas, a man well known for his broad views and tolerance, became Prime Minister. In practice, therefore, much freedom exists for the expression of political opinions alike in the so-called opposition Press and in the organs representing the Government. These circumstances clearly show that Lithuania does not intend to adopt the totalitarian methods in the full meaning of the word. In the new Parliament, formed on the basis principle of non-party representation, the voice of criticism may often be heard, and such criticism is valued in the country since it is no longer based on demagoguery.

In domestic policy, although the procedure may not be fully democratic, yet in practice it is not far removed from the substance of democracy. A certain discipline in public affairs is expected from the citizen, but at the same time the fundamental rights of individual liberty are recognised on his behalf. At present Lithuania's domestic political barometer is plainly veering towards essential democracy.

### IV.

In foreign policy Lithuania was confronted with serious problems from the very beginning. The two fundamental issues were her relations with her two powerful neighbours, Poland and Germany.

Almost from the very beginning of independence, relations with the former were not satisfactory. Poland took it for granted that the Lithuanians should remember the historic past, and form a political union with her, as had been done in 1569 at Lublin. Moreover, the Poles seized a great deal of former Lithuanian territory, admittedly considerably polonised during the last century. Further, they seized by force Lithuania's former capital, Vilna. For these reasons no diplomatic relations existed between the two countries from 1920 until March, 1938. There was not even a State frontier, but only a demarcation line, which after the negotiations of 1938 was styled an administrative line. This abnormal condition of things lasted a long time. The actual facts of this state of affairs were not in every case clear to third parties. Lithuania had on her side very cogent legal and historical arguments for maintaining unsettled relations with Poland as a mark of protest. Repeated negotiations in various European capitals and elsewhere failed to yield any concrete results. Discussion of the question before the League of Nations at Geneva fared no better. Finally, in 1931, the Permanent Court of International Justice at The Hague unanimously decided that from a juridical standpoint Lithuania had the right to refuse to maintain diplomatic relations with Poland. This situation lasted until 19 March last year, when Poland, on a flimsy pretext, presented Lithuania with an ultimatum demanding that she enter on normal diplomatic relations within a specified time. Lithuania was obliged to accept that ultimatum. At the beginning of April, 1938, diplomatic relations between Lithuania and Poland were at last implemented. In view of the swiftly changing international situation, and common Lithuanian and Polish interests, on the resumption of diplomatic relations wholly normal intercourse began between the two countries, although certain political problems have been postponed for the time being. Generally speaking, therefore, Lithuania's relations with Poland today may be deemed satisfactory.

The other great concern of Lithuania's foreign policy has always been her relations with Germany. After the Great War those relations did not create any problem for either Lithuania or Germany. Germany was Lithuania's nearest neighbour, with whom trade was conducted. Furthermore, after the war a weakened Germany could not prefer any claims against Lithuania. On the contrary, fearing Poland, Germany supported as far as possible Lithuania's efforts to defend herself against Poland, or at any rate regarded them with sympathy. Germany was particularly important for

## LITHUANIA: THE FIRST TWENTY YEARS. 615

Lithuania's foreign trade. There were indeed times when about 75 per cent. of Lithuania's export went to Germany.

When on 15 January, 1923, the Memel Territory, detached from Germany under Article 99 of the Versailles Treaty, was united with Lithuania, Berlin showed no anger. On the contrary, well-informed circles in Berlin were then satisfied that this small region, with a mixed population at least half of which was of Lithuanian origin, was not ceded to Poland. (Apparently at that time the Poles entertained designs on the port of Memel). Prominent leaders of Weimar Germany subsequently assured Lithuanian politicians that they need have no fears on account of the Memel territory, so long as the Lithuanian Government guaranteed the German minority cultural and municipal autonomy. In 1928 a treaty was signed in Berlin between Lithuania and Germany adjusting the State boundaries between the two countries. The impression was universal that an era of normal neighbourly relations with Germany had set in for a long period. When, however, Germany changed her domestic political aspect, she changed also her foreign policy. The German elements in the Memel territory, taking advantage of the extensive local autonomy which had been guaranteed to this territory, not only by Lithuania, but also by Great Britain, France, Italy and Japan (according to the Paris Convention of 1924), began to submit to National Socialist agitation and organised in 1934 a rising against the Lithuanian Republic. Those implicated were arrested and tried by a military court at the beginning of 1935. This court, after a protracted trial, sentenced some scores of the accused to various terms of imprisonment. The result aroused great indignation in Germany, and still more intensive propaganda against Lithuania. Germany then believed she would be able to coerce her tiny neighbour economically by closing her markets to Lithuanian goods. Nevertheless, this economic repression failed to achieve its purpose. Convinced of the justice of her position, Lithuania refused to submit, believing, as she did, in the validity of the principles of justice in international relations. Intercourse with Germany again gradually improved. The President of the Republic, availing himself of his prerogative of mercy, then pardoned the accused still undergoing imprisonment for treason to the State.

However, following the settlement of the Austrian and Sudeten German problems, the German National Socialists of the Memel territory began to react, and demanded more and more freedom of organisation, until they finally obtained everything, even the

introduction of German Nazi uniforms and the Nazi salute. Not content with this they began to remove the Lithuanian State emblem, the Vytiis or Rider, and the portrait of the President of the Republic from the autonomous institutions of this territory. They further decided no longer to observe the national holiday on the anniversary of Lithuania's declaration of independence, 16 February. In a word, in the autonomous Memel territory at the end of last year, a wholly undisguised National Socialistic régime with all its symbols came into power. The Lithuanian central Government, not wishing to disturb good relations with Germany, showed itself very liberal and yielding to the Memel Nazis. There is now only one question: Will this position satisfy Berlin? Lithuania is deeply interested in the maintenance of amity with Germany. She is also greatly concerned in the retention of the port of Memel, which during recent years she has largely modernised and expanded because about 80 per cent. of her export and import trade passes through Memel.

Berlin, too, seems to understand the necessity of the port. The entire issue today therefore depends upon the attitude of the Third Reich. Lithuania has already made all possible concessions to the Memel Nazis, having gone far beyond the bounds of the Statute, and to her own detriment, in the quest for a *modus vivendi*.<sup>1</sup>

With her other neighbours, especially with Latvia and Estonia, Lithuania's relations have always been good. It is well understood that the destinies of the Baltic States are closely connected. The new State has, therefore, always favoured the "Baltic entente" which was effected in 1934, and with whose operation up to this time Lithuania is entirely satisfied.

With Soviet Russia Lithuania's relations have been good ever since the Peace Treaty of 1920, notwithstanding that in Lithuania the Communist Party is illegal. With France there have been the most cordial relations for very many years. Especially in the cultural sphere it is that those relations are clearly visible. With Great Britain, Lithuania's relations are also excellent, particularly in the field of trade. Latterly, too, cultural relations have begun to develop, and more and more Lithuanians are coming to England to study. The English, through organisations such as the British Council, are extending much support to this movement.

## V.

During the first twenty years of independent life Lithuania has made very great progress in all organised branches of activity.

<sup>1</sup> Written, of course, before the last events.—ED.



## LITHUANIA: THE FIRST TWENTY YEARS. 617

The visitor from abroad can convince himself of this by even a passing glance at our country-side, but he will find even more striking examples of change and progress in the provisional capital of Kaunas. Standing on a historic and picturesque site at the junction of the Nemunas and Neris rivers, Kaunas has grown in two decades from a provincial town of 50,000 people to an imposing city and administrative centre of 120,000. Already noted for its ancient churches and other monuments, it has now added new ones in the modern style: not meant to compete with the structures now rising in world capitals, but exactly suited to the modest temper of the Lithuanian people, and to its needs. On the hill above the Town Square stands a striking new Church of the Resurrection. Not far away are the imposing State University buildings, and, of course, the homes of the various Ministries. A special feature of the city will be the splendid parks and beaches being laid out along the river banks, to be dedicated to the uses of the population as a whole. In this and other ways Kaunas sets an example of utility and beauty to the eager and ambitious people

Lithuania is surely destined to live in freedom for further decades, and the results of these may be even more impressive. Her destiny, like that of all Europe, must, however, largely depend upon whether or not peace can be preserved. In Lithuania everybody knows that even for great and powerful nations peace is a fundamental condition not only of general well-being, but also of existence itself. It therefore goes without saying that all news from abroad which speaks of peace is particularly valued in Lithuania. The nation enters upon the third decade of its freedom imbued with the hope of being able to make still greater progress. If only peace is not disturbed, all patriots are confident that this hope will be abundantly fulfilled.<sup>2</sup>

VALENTINE GUSTAINIS.

<sup>2</sup> This article, as will be evident to the reader, was written before the recent most disturbing events.

## CATHERINE II AND RADISHCHEV<sup>1</sup>

CATHERINE II of Russia left a deep trace on the history, not only of Russia, but of the whole of 18th century Europe. Two hundred years seems to be a sufficiently long period of time for an idea of any historical personage to become crystallised and definite enough to be generally accepted; yet the personality of the famous "Northern Semiramis" is still an object of controversy. Despite all her striking characteristics we still do not see the figure of the Empress in its full stature, and next to enraptured praises one can hear a stern and unequivocal judgment passed on her. Time, of course, does its work, and opinions, whether favourable or unfavourable, have now become quieter and more objective, so that sarcastic invectives are left to the lot of gifted novelists who can make full use of the Empress's weaknesses and shortcomings—and no one would deny that she had more than her share of those. Yet even now, besides fiction writers, there are historians who see above all the "dark spots" on the surface of Catherine's "sun" and judge her reign accordingly. Without wishing to argue about the dimensions and the importance of these "spots," we should like to point to one of them, for it is high time to wash it off her memory, or at least to scrape some of the blackness so richly laid on by posterity. We are referring to the fate of Radishchev, the famous author of *A Journey from Petersburg to Moscow* (1790).

Radishchev will have for ever attached to him the undisputed merit of a man who raised his voice against the terrible scourge of his time—serfdom. Moreover, as is rightly pointed out by one of its modern students,<sup>2</sup> "Radishchev's book is a real encyclopædia of the evils of Russian life of the time, written by one of its few enlightened representatives who was brought up on the advanced ideas of that remarkable age. This book is a passionate and fervent propaganda of genuinely humanitarian social ideals, an invective against all the iniquity of Russian reality in various domains of public life. In it have found a place problems of the nature and foundations of government,

<sup>1</sup> Professor E. Shmurlo, who died several years ago, was the representative of the Imperial Academy of Sciences in Italy. It will be understood that this *Review* publishes articles of the most varied views, especially on subjects of historical interest.

<sup>2</sup> V. L. Burtsev.

of the rights of citizens, of freedom of thought, speech and conscience, of the relations between social orders and classes, problems of religion, of morals, of education, of moral philosophy, of literature, etc. The supreme power, the higher and lower administration, the censorship, the courts, officialdom, the nobility, the clergy, the merchant class, and, at the core of it all, the bonded peasantry, miserable and deprived of rights, have found in Radishchev either their ardent detractor or their bold champion."

But alongside of this noble pathos we find in Radishchev's book such naive and childish attacks against autocracy, against its very principle, such a fanatically intolerant attitude to the very idea of autocratic government, that one cannot help recalling the word "madman" which Catherine II applied to the author after reading his book. What is typical is not Radishchev's attacks on the autocratic government but his naïve belief that they would go unpunished.

The Tsar as the bearer of supreme power appeared to Radishchev as the torturer of his people, and he dreamt of the time when the people's army would rise against its tyrant and hasten "to wash off in his blood the disgrace of their secular slavery." He saw "sharp swords flashing everywhere" and "death hovering over the Tsar's proud head." In an ecstasy he exclaimed: "Rejoice, ye peoples who have so many years languished in heavy fetters. Nature herself has given you the right of revenge, and it is by right that you take your Tsar to the execution block."

Even this was not enough for Radishchev and he proceeded to paint the following picture: "Tearing off with a mighty hand the veil of deceit and throwing off the high pedestal its former idol," the people chains up "the giant with a hundred arms," brings him to trial and flings at him the following accusation. "Tell us, thou criminal and crowned villain, how daredst thou rise against us? We have clothed thee with purple so that thou shouldst observe equal justice towards everyone, be a champion of widows and orphans, protect the innocent and weak from harm, be a beloved father to them, punish mercilessly vice, lying and calumny, and reward deserts appropriately—but thou hast forgotten thine oaths, forgotten that thou art but a nominee of the people and that the people is the master and not thou."

Radishchev's revolutionary passion reached its culminating point when he thus apostrophised Cromwell: "Ay, thou wert

cruel and perfidious, a bigot and a hypocrite ; thou hast profaned things sacred ; thou wert the greatest villain in the world, for, possessed of the plenitude of power, thou hast abolished every manifestation of freedom in thy people. And yet thou art a great man, because thou wert the first to dare show a beneficent example to the peoples by executing, in accordance with the people's judgment, your King Charles ; thou hast taught mankind how to avenge itself on its oppressors . . . ."

Apart from other things, Catherine saw a personal attack against herself in that passage of Radishchev's book where he describes a despot on the throne surrounded by hypocritical flatterers. Truth had to approach him and remove the cataract from his eyes to enable him to see the difference between the real state of affairs in his realm and the description of it in the mendacious reports of his Ministers.

Radishchev had to pay dearly for his reckless words ; he was banished to a remote and desolate corner of Siberia, Ilimsk,<sup>3</sup> where he remained until the accession of Paul, who allowed him to return to his country place and live there. Under Alexander I, Radishchev regained full freedom and was even readmitted into the Civil Service.

Catherine II, no doubt, was more severe to Radishchev than one might have expected of her. But what fate would have awaited him had his book appeared in Western Europe, in one of the countries whose political régime was akin to Russia's, is a moot point. Catherine lived during the age when in France, the most progressive and cultured of the countries with an autocratic régime, Marmontel's *Vélisaire* was proscribed by the Sorbonne ; when Helvetius's book *De l'Esprit* was burnt in a bonfire and the same fate was meted out to Rousseau's *Emile* ; when the *Encyclopédie* could appear only with its original text cut and disfigured. Not a long time before, in 1777, the author of the book called *Philosophie de la nature* had been, according to one judgment, sentenced to flogging, branding and hard labour for life, and, according to another, to be pilloried in his shirt and with a firebrand in his hand on the porch of Notre-Dame Cathedral and made to recant publicly. We must not forget that according to the French law of 1757 an author was liable to the death penalty if his works contained attacks against religion or against the Royal authority, or in general if they were

<sup>3</sup> About 1,000 kilometres to the north of Irkutsk.

likely to excite the minds and disturb the tranquillity of the State. Judging by these examples, we are entitled to suppose that in France Radishchev's lot would have been even more bitter.

In order to estimate Catherine's behaviour in Radishchev's case in its true light, we must not forget at what moment his book appeared. It was the beginning of the French Revolution; the throne of France's autocratic rulers was being shattered; the Bastille was already destroyed and the rebels were dancing on its ruins; the Paris mob had already compelled the Royal family to leave Versailles; the Clubs were speechifying, and Marat, in his *Ami du Peuple*, was sounding the alarm and calling to general rebellion. The diffusion of Radishchev's ideas at such a moment acquired a specific character; it could easily be interpreted as an appeal to follow the example of the French. As a Sovereign, Catherine could not allow anything of the kind. In her opinion Mirabeau should have been hanged "not on one but on several gallows," while Radishchev placed him on the same footing with Demosthenes and Cicero and admired his oratorical gifts. The storming of the Bastille had greatly annoyed Catherine; in the National Assembly she saw another version of the followers of Pugachev, who had caused Russia so many troubles and disasters. Ten years earlier, Radishchev's book would have been viewed, perhaps, quite leniently; but now, when its author shouted *à la Marat* and allowed himself sentences such as this: "Tell me, please, in whose head can there be more nonsense than in the Tsar's?" the Empress could not preserve her equanimity. In his naïveté Radishchev gave her every reason to regard his conduct as one of the manifestations of the "French plague." In the Empress's manuscript remarks on the book we read: "The author demonstrates on every page that he is imbued and infected with French fallacies; he deliberately seeks every means of undermining the people's respect for the authorities and inciting them against the government."

Altogether it can be said that Radishchev was punished not because of his ardent protests against serfdom—the Empress herself had previously spoken boldly and openly against it—but because of his attacks on the Government, on those very foundations on which Russia's political régime was based at the time. The Empress could not, had not the right to, let those attacks pass unnoticed.

In any event, Radishchev's case is but an episode in the reign of Catherine II which cannot alter its general bright tone. The colossal growth of Russian literature in the second half of the 18th century and the progress of public opinion in the reign of Catherine are facts beyond doubt, and one individual episode cannot impair their importance. The very possibility of such a book as Radishchev's *Journey* appearing was clear evidence of the great progress made by Russian political thought under Catherine II.

E. SHMURLO.

## RUSSIA AND AFRICA.

I AM afraid the title of my studies may be at first sight regarded as a printer's error. For we are so much accustomed today, when considering Russia's extra-European activities, to think first of other continents—of Asia and perhaps America also.

The struggle of Russia for Asia, which is still going on, and the history of the first Russian colonies on American soil, from Alaska to San Francisco, have already been often studied. What do we know, on the other hand, of Russia's African policy? As far as I know, there has been no attempt to make an exhaustive study of this question. In the collective bibliographical work—*Bibliographie d'histoire coloniale* 1900-30—edited in 1932 by Martineau, where even the colonial activity of Poland is given a special chapter, one would seek in vain for a similar chapter on Russia. This field of investigation has up to the present been badly neglected, although as long ago as 1859 the great Russian scholar Lamansky urged historians to take up the interesting study of the important relations which have existed between the Slavonic world and Africa.

Obviously, in one article it is impossible to cover the whole ground; I hope to do so in a special book, now in preparation. What I therefore propose to do here is, by means of a few characteristic examples, based on old and quite recently published sources, as well as on information scattered in special articles and in general history books, to illustrate the most varied aspects of Russia's African policy down the centuries: alliances, colonisation projects, plans for protectorates, religious propaganda, naval demonstrations with the object of maintaining the *status quo*, and on the other hand, conspiracy and underground activity with a view to altering the political map of Africa. No less varied have been the motives which have over and over again brought Africa closer to the attention of Russia: political considerations and religious day-dreams, economic and imperialistic ideas, colonial aspirations, and ever and again the desire of Russia to play off Africa in the larger issues at stake—the struggle for India, for Constantinople, and especially for the weakening of England.

I shall further limit my survey of Russia's African policy to the last four centuries, although we possess quite good evidence of the interest taken by Russia in Africa in much

earlier times also. It is reported, for instance, that already the Kievan Prince St. Vladimir had sent 1001 envoys to Egypt. And long before the election of the Romanovs, frequent contacts were made between the penniless Patriarchate of Alexandria and the rich orthodox Kremlin of Moscow.

For the 'seventies of the 17th century we possess also a historical document, addressed to the Duke of Saxe-Gotha by a German clergyman in Moscow, which is of great interest for our investigations. First, he says that two Court physicians were at that time dismissed in Moscow because they had given out that they were Scotsmen, when in reality they were Englishmen. In those days this made a very great difference in Russia, as the pious Tsar Alexis declined to entrust his life and health to the hands of Englishmen, the murderers of their own King, Charles I. More important for us, however, is the further information given in the letter, in which it was alleged that in Moscow at that time no one had any knowledge of Abyssinia. What possible interest could the Germany of the 17th century, and in particular a quiet little Dukedom like Saxe-Gotha, have had in the question of the relations between Russia and the remote African land?

Muscovite Russia was for many centuries entirely outside the European family of peoples. Muscovy herself was rather slow in developing contacts with Western Europe. Today, too, we can see with what suspicion Soviet Russia regards contact with the capitalist West. With similar mistrust the official Russia of the 19th century looked at a liberal Western Europe infected with the ideas of the French Revolution. And in the same way the Muscovy of the 15th, 16th and 17th centuries suspected the "heretical" Europe of that time. And her mistrust of the English Puritans, as was shown by the case of the English doctors, quite equalled her mistrust of the Roman Catholics.

On the other hand, Western Europe of the 16th and 17th centuries watched the obviously growing power of "barbarous" Russia with the very greatest suspicion and concern. In the first half of the 17th century, for instance, the French King Henry IV conceived a plan to unite all Christendom in a Christian Commonwealth. All European States, whether large or small, were to be members of this body, which foreshadowed the League of Nations of today. The plan foreshadowed quite modern ideas:—a General Council, successive and elective



States, a reserve of money and men, to which every dominion was to contribute, etc. Only infidels, according to the plan of the Most Christian King, were to be kept at a distance from this Christian body, and these were the Turks, the Tartars, and, surprisingly enough, the Muscovites—the Orthodox Christian Russians.

As time went on, it was, however, precisely the struggle of Western Europe against the growing power of the Osmons which finally opened the door of Europe to Russia. Once again, in the second half of the 17th century, the crusading spirit awoke in Western Europe. The Turk was now a dangerous opponent; and Christian Europe looked around for allies who could set upon him from the rear. The possible partners were Persia, Abyssinia and Russia. And just in this connection arose in Saxe-Gotha the extremely interesting project of linking together Russia, Abyssinia and Western Europe, in an anti-Turkish League.

In 1674 this Russo-Abyssinian alliance actually became the object of intense diplomatic negotiations between Russia and Saxe-Gotha, and the plan seems now to have taken palpable shape. The new friendship between Russia and Abyssinia was to be based on three pillars—similarity of religion, common enmity to the Mohammedan Turks, and, of course, the seductive wealth—reputed or actual—of this African land. In Western Europe it was formerly believed that the Abyssinians, as Christians, stood nearest to the Russians—not only in their faith but also in their alleged manners and customs. It was known, further, how implacably the Turks were hated by the Abyssinians, whose trade had suffered much under Turkish domination in the ports of the Red Sea. Lack of an outlet to the sea seems to have been in the 17th century, as it was until recently, the greatest hindrance to that country's economic development. If, however, the Negus were once won for the common struggle against the Turk, the gold and the silver and the pearls of Abyssinia would naturally flow into the European treasuries. Even earlier a sort of 17th century Mr. Rickett had been sent to Abyssinia by the Duke of Saxe-Gotha. His Saxon predecessor also was to investigate on the spot the wealth of Abyssinia, her fertility, her mines, and above all was to examine the sources of the Nile.

The plan to set foot in Abyssinia had its attractions 260 years ago, as it has today. All the same, the attempts of Saxe-Gotha

in the 'seventies of the 17th century to build up friendly relations between Muscovy and Abyssinia were unsuccessful. Russia seems to have been more interested at that time in alliances with European courts. She needed prompt assistance against her Turkish neighbour. The Abyssinian undertaking seemed to be uncertain and would take too much time to set going.

In spite of this first failure, the plan for Russo-Abyssinian friendship was not altogether abandoned. When in 1683, that is, nearly ten years later, the Turks had pushed as far as Vienna, the idea was once more taken up. It even formed part of a still more far-reaching project: Abyssinia was now to be brought immediately into contact with quite a number of European States, and first and foremost with England. The motive power seems to have come from Hiob Ludolf, the Duke of Saxony's former adviser and well-known expert on Abyssinia, who was at the time serving the German Emperor. He knew that the Abyssinians hated Catholicism and the Jesuits, and that therefore it was not through Rome or the immediately threatened Catholic Vienna that the Negus was to be won for Europe and the struggle against Turkey, but through Puritan England and Orthodox Russia. In a message drawn up in the Amharic language Ludolf challenged the Negus to send a capable man to England to study the Faith and ecclesiastical institutions of this country, which was independent of Rome. Ludolf even came personally to London in 1683 to work here on the spot for the closer collaboration of the two countries. But at the same time as these negotiations were being carried on in London, Russia was also, with the cognisance of Ludolf, being urged to send an accredited representative to Abyssinia. Several Western Europeans were this time to go with the Russian envoy—an interpreter, a doctor, a barber, a mining expert and an armourer. It was expected that the Negus, flattered by this Embassy from the Orthodox Russian Tsar, would emerge all the sooner from his isolation and henceforth would be ready to take up arms with the European Powers against Constantinople.

However, the efforts to bring about an understanding with Abyssinia in the 'eighties of the 17th century remained as fruitless in London as in Moscow. The Russians, like the English at that time, had very little interest to spare for Abyssinia. The English King Charles the Second had given an audience to the German scholar Ludolf, but had characteristically sent him on to the East India Company, who, it seems, could

foresee no benefit to themselves from the suggested combination with Abyssinia. And also in Moscow, where at that time two minors were Tsars, very little desire was shown to be involved in adventurous undertakings.

The plans proved to be premature. It was 200 years later, in the 'seventies of the last century, that the Negus John repeatedly spoke of a united struggle of Russia and Abyssinia against the Mohammedans, and even hoped with confidence that one day he and the Russian Tsar would meet in Jerusalem.

Forty years later, at the beginning of the 18th century, at a turning point in the development of the Russian State and people, a new attempt was made to bring Russia and Africa together. This time, however, Russia was strong enough to take the initiative herself.

The reign of Peter the Great was full of reforms in every field. An Empire had grown out of the former Muscovite Tsardom. In the place of the Boyar with his pride of family, came the Petersburg bureaucrat, all-powerful until 1917, and owing personal allegiance to the Tsar. With the long Russian kaftan reaching to the ground, and the sacredly cherished beard, there vanished also the Streltsy, the men-at-arms of old Muscovite Russia. They were replaced by an army remodelled on European lines, and the Russian Guard. A very important achievement of Peter the Great was, further, the building of the Russian Fleet. And in a modern army and navy Peter had created for himself the necessary instruments of an active and far-reaching foreign policy.

In the field of foreign relations the same genius was to be seen. Peter maintained "that there were three points of capital importance" which he desired to gain for Russia: "the mouth of the Don in the South giving access to the Black Sea, the river Neva in North Russia as access to the Baltic, and the river Amur in the Far East as access to the Pacific and China." Peter gained the Neva in 1721 for Russia. He failed to secure the Don. But the same Danish Admiral Behring who was commissioned by Peter to examine the relative position of Asia and America was also "to open up the Amur question, possibly in connection with an expedition by land." By sending Russian garrisons to Bukhara and Khiva Peter hoped to bring these two important central Asiatic Khanates under a Russian protectorate. And on the same day on which by a ukaz he flung open the gates of Russia to craftsmen from Western Europe, by another

ukaz he commissioned four Russian boys to learn Japanese. It is also noteworthy that in the negotiations with the Turkish Sultan he is reported even to have tried to get the latter's permission for the removal of the Holy Tomb to Russia. It was a gigantic programme of a man of vision. But that was not enough. Besides Europe, Asia and America, Africa also was included in the far-flung schemes of Peter's foreign activities.

In December, 1723, two Russian warships lying in the roadstead before Reval in the Baltic received an order from the Tsar to set out on a long sea journey. The whole undertaking was to be kept a dead secret from everyone, especially from Great Britain. The two warships were to sail under the trading flag. Only in case of need were they permitted to enter a harbour. Above all, however, the two frigates, after passing the Sound, were to make a wide sweep round Scotland and Ireland. In no circumstances were they to take the shorter way through the Channel, lest they aroused the suspicions of the English. And only on the open sea were even the two captains of the frigates to learn what was to be the goal of the journey which they had undertaken. This goal was Africa—Madagascar, to be exact, with whose presumable king Peter at that time desired to enter into friendly relations. The visit of the Russian ships was to be only the first step. According to the Tsar's plans, later on either a representative of the "highly esteemed King and Owner of the glorious Island of Madagascar" or even the monarch himself in his own person, was to come to St. Petersburg with the object of concluding a real Pact of Friendship. But a further possibility was already foreseen at that time. In case it proved that actually there was no King in Madagascar the Tsar was ready to consider forming a Russian colony there, under a Governor appointed by himself.<sup>1</sup>

What was the object of this rather strange tentative approach of Russia to Africa? What was the actual meaning of this expedition of 1723 to the far-distant Madagascar, and what were the supposed advantages of founding there a Russian colony?

Since the middle of the 17th century the French had tried, at great material sacrifice and with very little success, to establish trading settlements in Madagascar. Other countries also began to take an interest in this island in the 18th century. Among others Sweden, on the advice of convicts who had taken

<sup>1</sup> A document referring to this expedition is preserved in the British Museum. See *Slavonic Review*, Vol. IV, p. 677

refuge there, wanted to found a sort of Swedish colony on Madagascar. And through the indiscretion of a Swedish admiral, Peter heard of these secret plans of his rival and enemy. But can it be said that the Tsar's undertaking in Madagascar was only an imitation of foreign ideas? Or did he know how to bring the stimulus from the outside world into harmony with Russia's foreign aspirations? The latter was the case. For the Swedes Madagascar was an end in itself, a convenient place for trade with the interior of Africa. The same island, on the other hand, was for Russia an important junction and fulcrum on the sea route to India, the land upon which the desires of the leading European peoples, the Russians included, were set.

It is an established fact that Russia from very early days sought to enter into relations with the fairy-tale land of India. Already in the middle of the 15th century a merchant, Nikitin of Tver, was the first Russian actually to succeed in getting to India. And after that there was no break in the sequence of Russian attempts to get into touch with that country. The appearance of the English in Russia in the 16th century gave only a further impetus to this. Peter the Great, too, took great trouble to draw India into the system of Russian foreign trade. With this in view he even planned "to make the river Amu-Darya flow once again into the Caspian." But all the attempts of Russia to ensure a trade route to India overland or along the rivers, through Central Asia, through Turkey, Persia, Siberia and China, were, on the whole, unsuccessful.

But was not the sea route to India now also open to Russia, thanks to Peter's newly created fleet? In fact, we already hear in 1720 of Peter's ingenious plans to reach India by way of the Arctic Ocean. And so his extraordinary plan to set foot in Madagascar seems to have represented only a new expedient in the same direction. Peter at that time was less concerned with opening up the Dark Continent, of which only a very vague idea was then current in Russia, than with the treasures, or, as one should say today, the raw materials of India. The efforts for Russo-Abyssinian friendship in the 17th century were to be understood in the light of the struggle against Osman domination; and in the same way the plan of a Russian colony on Madagascar in the 18th century must be considered as only a stage in Russia's fight for a trade route to India. For Russia, Africa was less an end in itself than a means to an end.

All the same, this attempt of Russia, so to speak, to capture

India through Africa, led to nothing. As one of the two Russian frigates began "to leak immediately on reaching the open sea," the expedition had to be given up. And it was not until nearly 200 years later, during the Russo-Japanese war of 1904-5, that the Russian Baltic Fleet on its way to the Pacific anchored off the coast of Madagascar.

Nor was any progress made in the reign of Peter the Great in the establishment of closer relations between Russia and Abyssinia. A memorandum presented in 1751 to the Russian envoy in Constantinople by the Patriarch of Alexandria and recently found in the archives of the Holy Synod shows, however, that this monarch, too, was at the end of his reign seriously concerned with the reunion of the Abyssinians with the Orthodox Church, the first step to the conclusion of a Russo-Abyssinian alliance. According to other documents from Rome, Peter was further thinking, in 1718, of sending to Abyssinia a scientific expedition for the study of her position, customs and resources under the leadership of an Italian Franciscan priest whom he had released from captivity in Persia. The choice appears significant and well-calculated, for Italian Catholics were at that time, as well as later, particularly interested in the "discovery" of this African land.

Another forty years went by after the death of Peter the Great—we come now to the Egyptian question. The struggle for the Baltic had already been settled under Peter. The *cordon sanitaire* which separated Russia in the North-West from Europe had fallen. But the settlement of the no less important question of the Black Sea in the South had been left to the Empress Catherine the Great. In contradiction to the origins and geographical situation of the Russian State, it was the Pacific Coast that was first acquired by the Russians, then the Baltic and only in the end the Black Sea.

For centuries Russia had been cut off from entrance to the Black Sea and also to the Mediterranean. This meant an open frontier in the South, and a standing danger of invasion by the Tartars of the steppes. And behind this warrior-people stood the Turks as their protectors, and behind the Turks again stood France, the ancient enemy of Russia. This separation from the sea signified not only a constant strategic threat, but also a considerable economic disadvantage and detriment to Russia. The Black Sea had become a Turkish inland lake. The Russian merchants could carry on trade only on Turkish ships. The

historical passage to the Mediterranean world was furthermore almost completely blocked by the closing of the Bosphorus. It was clear that a change in the existing unbearable conditions and also the creation for Russia of direct political and trade relations with the Mediterranean countries, as well as with Africa on the other side of the Turkish cordon, could be enforced only by considerable military successes against the Turks. And, in fact, the inclusion of Egypt in the Russian sphere of influence and its intended exploitation as a base of Russian power in the Mediterranean stood in connection with the so-called First Turkish War, begun by Catherine in 1768. Strangely enough, this was also the fruit of close Anglo-Russian co-operation.

Wars with Turkey had been carried on by Russia repeatedly at different times. What was new, unheard of and revolutionary in this First Turkish War was Catherine's command to the Russian Baltic Fleet to attack the Turks from the rear in the Turkish waters of the Mediterranean, after sailing round the European continent and passing through the straits of Gibraltar. The military success of this daring Russian expedition in the Mediterranean was made possible only by the help of England and the opening of her South coast ports. The Russian Baltic squadron was under the command of a Scot, and there were many English officers on board the Russian ships, which, considerably damaged by storms in the North Sea, could be made seaworthy again and continue on their way only after extensive repairs in England. English transports accompanied the Russians even to the Mediterranean. In June, 1770, then, the Turkish fleet was practically destroyed by the Russians in the famous battle of Chesme. And this victory by Russia, and the Peace of 1774 which followed, not only opened the Straits to Russian trading vessels but were also of decisive importance for Russia's position in the Mediterranean. Russia had suddenly become a South-European Power. The impression which this changed position of Russia made upon the political imagination of the Mediterranean peoples was a lasting one. Not only the Christian Balkan peoples, but also, what is generally overlooked, the Mohammedans of Egypt, in their striving for independence, now saw in Russia a powerful ally in the struggle against the domination of the Turk. And Russia on her side actually began from now on to take an ever greater and more permanent interest in the shaping of the situation in Africa. The fact that one of the Russian frigates taking part in the battle of Chesme

already bore the name of "Africa" acquires an almost symbolic significance.

Only a few examples of Russo-Egyptian co-operation in the 18th century can be given here. Shortly before and during the Russo-Turkish war, the Mameluk Ali-Bey succeeded for a few years in making Egypt independent of the Porte. Being then once more hard pressed by the Turks, he tried—not without success—to make connection with the Russian Mediterranean fleet. The Commander-in-Chief of the Russian forces, Count Alexis Orlov, sent to his assistance in September, 1772, in a Russian transport but under British colours, two officers—disguised as Englishmen—with guns and ammunition, and in December a Russian squadron bombarded for two days the port of Jaffa besieged by the troops of Ali-Bey. The Empress Catherine herself in her famous correspondence with Voltaire followed Ali-Bey's struggle against the Porte with the greatest admiration and described him as her friend. And, on the other hand, Ali-Bey "for his alliance with the Russian infidels" was accused by his enemies "to be himself more an infidel Christian in his heart than a Mussulman."

Immediately after the end of the First Turkish War relations were established between Russia and the Mameluks Muhad and Ibrahim, who were fighting for the independence of Egypt against the overlordship of the Turks. The Egyptians even seem to have sent an emissary to St. Petersburg. And in 1784 there were rumours of the conclusion of a highly interesting agreement, by which Russia was to have in Egypt rights similar to those which Great Britain has enjoyed there until recently. According to this agreement Russia was to stand up for the independence of Egypt in the next war with the Turks. And against this, Russia was to be granted the right to quarter Russian troops in Alexandria, Rosietta and Damietta. We see the change of times. In the peace negotiations of 1699 with Turkey, Peter the Great had insisted only on the right of free trade communications with Egypt.

In the next years signs of an understanding between the Russian Empress and the Egyptian rebels against the Sultan of Constantinople are on the increase. In the four years between 1784 and 1787 several Russian officers visited Egypt, where they were received with great honour as military advisers by the rebellious Beys. The Russian Government even facilitated the enlistment of Russian peasants' sons in the military formations



of the Mameluks; and by 1786 this militia was already one-quarter Russian.<sup>2</sup> But it was the idea that Russia, in the place of 500 peasants, would be able to send the rebel Muhammed Bey 500 Russian soldiers to assist him, which caused the French Consul in Egypt sleepless nights. In the 'eighties a Russian Consul appeared for the first time in Egypt, and at once took over the political leadership of the rebellion. And as the Beys in 1786 were suppressed by the Sultan, they appealed for the mediation of the Russian Consul, and the latter sought to defend the Beys by the assertion that the two Egyptian rebel leaders were under the protection of the Empress of Russia.

All this took place before the outbreak of the Second Russo-Turkish war, and when this had really begun in 1787 the appearance of a Russian relief squadron was awaited from day to day in Alexandria. Even the British Consul in Egypt and his French colleague now thought it advisable to warn their Governments against the danger of a lasting settlement of the Russians in Egypt. These apprehensions, however, proved to be exaggerated. The plan of a second Russian Mediterranean naval expedition, although discussed, proved to be unworkable, owing to Russia's war with Sweden and the anti-Russian feeling in England. Only a single Russian frigate, accompanied by two transports, appeared in 1788 at the port of Damietta. But this attempt, too, to supply the rebellious Beys with Russian weapons, munitions and money was wrecked by the unskilful handling of the Russian Consul. The new Russo-Turkish peace of 1791 brought Russia a few further territorial acquisitions. Egypt, however, continued to remain Turkish.

These examples are sufficient to show the keen interest with which Russia in the 'seventies and 'eighties of the 18th century had followed and supported the unrest in Africa and the struggle of Egypt against Constantinople. Did Russia really think at that time of a permanent settlement in Egypt? Hardly. The Empress of Russia gladly conspired with the anti-Turkish rebels in order to prevent the power of the Sultan from becoming strong in Egypt, the granary of Turkey. The friendship of the

<sup>2</sup> A curious reference to the spreading of the Russian language to Egypt even as far back as the early 16th century, can be found in the description of Russia by the Bishop of Nocera Paolo Giovo published in 1525. According to his information, Russian was not only spoken at that time in Constantinople, but was also "willingly listened to" at the Court of the Sultan of Memphis and by the Mameluk horsemen.

Mameluks was of importance in her struggle against the Turks. But the final goal of Russian diplomatic and military activities at that time was the possession of Constantinople. The partition of Turkey was already dreamed of in St. Petersburg, as this alone would hand Constantinople over to Russia. But in this case, according to some Russian plans, France was to have Egypt as a consolation prize and compensation for agreeing to this project of partition.

Very enlightening in this connection is the attitude of Russia to the Egyptian question after the death of Catherine, when, at the turn of the 18th century, through the expedition of Napoleon to Egypt, an entirely new situation arose in the Mediterranean.

Napoleon looked upon the Mediterranean as intended by nature to be a French lake. Since the failure of the attempt of Saint Louis in the 13th century to conquer Egypt, France had, it is true, left this land alone for five and a half centuries. But France knew how, by dominating the Levantine trade, to create for herself in the course of centuries a powerful position in the Eastern Mediterranean. Against fifty French merchants counted in Cairo in 1725 there were only two English and two Dutch. In numerous and widely-read publications the French public was informed of the favourable geographical position of Egypt as a land of transit to India, and its economic importance from a colonial point of view. This is particularly significant when one realises that at the same time "the British Government steadily lost interest in Egypt, discovering there neither attractive commercial opportunities nor a reliable high road to India."

The anaemic France of the *ancien régime*, however, no longer had the courage for a military occupation of Egypt. The carrying out of this plan was left to the genius of the General of the Revolutionary period. The French nation expected from him after his victories in Italy still greater successes, such as an invasion of England and a march on London. The 28-year-old Napoleon, however, for objective military reasons as well as on grounds of domestic policy, decided to transfer the seat of war to Africa, and to attack England indirectly. Fate seems to have been on his side. In the middle of May, 1798, Napoleon with his expeditionary corps left French soil. Nelson allowed his fleet to slip through. Hardly three weeks passed between the occupation of Alexandria and the entry into Cairo. By the end of July Napoleon could begin to make arrangements for

French rule in Egypt, in which, in the words of a French historian, he understood how to reconcile the Koran and the Rights of Man.

But what Napoleon in his calculations for this expedition seems to have underestimated was the degree of interest which Russia had taken in the Mediterranean in general, and in Egypt in particular. For if Napoleon was striving for a dominating position for France in the Mediterranean, Russia was doing the same for herself. If Napoleon saw in Egypt a support for his power policy in the Eastern Mediterranean, it was not otherwise with Russia. If for Napoleon's France Egypt was a postern gate to India, for Russia it was an outwork against Constantinople. In no circumstances could Russia permit the establishment of the French in Egypt *before* the partition of Turkey. Only after Constantinople had become Russian would Russia on her side tolerate the presence of the tricolour in Egypt. And so, the individual interests of France and Russia came into a severe collision in Egypt.

A few months before Napoleon's Egyptian expedition, the Russian Emperor Paul had joined the anti-French coalition. The occupation of Egypt by the French was in his eyes a direct intrusion into the Russian sphere of interest. He was horrified at this positively personal insult and the encroachment upon Russia's rights. In agreement with Turkey—thus constituting a complete reversal of his attitude but by no means of his aims in the Bosphorus—he now sent the Russian Black Sea Squadron to the Mediterranean. The Admiral in command was given the task of cutting off all connection of the French with their Motherland and with Italy. And in fact never, either before or since, has Russia's range of authority and influence in the Mediterranean and the Adriatic been as powerful as at that time.

But it did not last very long. Already in 1799, after the refusal of the English to hand over Malta to Russia, and the pulling down of the Russian flag in Ancona by the Austrians, the paths of the allies diverged. Neither the English nor the Austrians would or could tolerate the substitution of Russian for French domination in the Mediterranean. But an attempt undertaken now by Paul at an approach to Napoleon came up against the insolubility of the Egyptian question. Besides the possession of Malta and a kind of protectorate over the Italian territories, the evacuation of Egypt by the French was for Paul a principal condition of any understanding with Napoleon. Was

it possible for these desires of Russia in regard to Egypt ever to be fulfilled? Could Napoleon possibly give up Egypt of his own free will? Both Napoleon and his Foreign Minister Talleyrand absolutely refused to think of it. For this colony, they said, the best blood of France had been spilled. The possession of Egypt was for France the one single compensation for the vast colonial possessions of England and her control of the seas. Never would they willingly agree to evacuate Egypt as long as India, the Cape of Good Hope and the West Indies were held by England. Was there a way out? A partition of Turkey would perhaps have been an expedient to satisfy simultaneously the appetites of the two rivals. But such a partition could not be carried out. Or should mutual opposition to England unite these two countries to decide the fate of Egypt on the battlefields of India?

We do not know who was the initiator of a united Russo-French expedition for the conquest of India, or who it was who in 1801 set it going. It is, however, quite certain that the Emperor Paul joyfully fell in with this plan, and that Napoleon himself, apparently in order to secure Egypt for France, gave the appearance of being willing to join in this hazardous adventure. "35,000 French troops were to sail down the Danube, cross the Black Sea, and proceed to the Caspian, where they were to join an equal number of Russian troops for a march to the Indus." This united conquest of India was, as it seems, to induce Russia to renounce Egypt.

However, this remarkable plan, too, certainly only a makeshift in Napoleon's eyes, failed of accomplishment. The march to India, on which 22,000 Don Cossacks had, at the command of Paul, actually started, ended in disaster. The military preparations for the expedition were bad; "there were no maps, and the Cossacks, before reaching the Indian frontier, lost half their horses in the desert." And shortly afterwards the French army in Egypt had also to capitulate to the English. Thereby the situation was completely changed. By the Peace of Amiens in 1802 France had finally to renounce all claims to Egypt; Russia had therefore indirectly gained her ends. The Emperor Paul did not live to see the fulfilment of his wish. A year before, like so many Russian Tsars before and after him, he had fallen a victim to assassination.

If in conclusion we now glance over Russia's African policy in the 17th and 18th centuries, we must admit that the great

aims which it was to serve were not achieved. The Turks still dominated the Bosphorus. All attempts of Russia to incorporate Constantinople in the Empire came to nothing. And Russia succeeded no better in securing a highway to India.

In Africa itself, on the other hand, the Russian Government was able to record one great success. The right of Russia to have some say in the fate of Egypt was not only safeguarded, but also recognised by the other European powers as legitimate. In this connection the proposal of Great Britain to the Tsar Alexander I in the summer of 1801 is of the greatest interest and significance. The British Ambassador in St. Petersburg was at that time instructed to ascertain "whether Russia was disposed to guarantee jointly with His Majesty's Government the province of Egypt to Turkey in the event of the expulsion of the French. The Guarantee might include mutual stipulations to settle the proportion of forces which each party, England and Russia, should be obliged to furnish hereafter, should Egypt be again attacked."

The course of events leading to this British proposal of common protection of Egypt by British and Russian troops in May, 1801, perhaps best indicates also the rapid development of Russian strength. Instead of the struggle of centuries for the possession of old Russian territories and even single towns and villages on the Western land frontier, Russia began to take part in the struggle of the great Powers for Africa. And the thread is never again broken. Russia's African policy was to take strange forms in the 19th century, until at the beginning of the 20th it was in an extraordinary way brought into the service of Russia's domestic political problems—the struggle against revolution, and the search for foreign credits. But this will be the subject of a later article.

SERGIUS YAKOBSON.

# THE RUSSIANS IN THE UNITED STATES

## I

AMERICAN official statistics, as well as some writers on American immigration, include in the Russian group either all immigrants from former Russia or those of them who consider the Russian language as their "mother tongue." This article endeavours to limit the discussion to immigrants and their descendants of the Great Russian and White Russian groups.<sup>1</sup> No distinction is made between the Great Russians (Russians proper) and White Russians, because the latter in America seem to be entirely dominated by the first. White Russian organisations in the United States are very few and scattered. The only newspaper in White Russian, *Belorusskaya Tribuna*, a weekly of Chicago, edited by T. Y. Voronko, ceased to appear several years ago. The activities of other groups which are often designated as Russian, such as Russian Jews, various Caucasian, especially Georgian, circles, and Russophil Ukrainians (some of whom call themselves Russians, Little Russians, Carpato-Russians or South Russians) are treated only in cases when they affect or are closely interwoven with the group life of Russians proper.

### *Beginnings of Immigration*

After reaching the shores of the Pacific Ocean (in 1643) the Russian Cossacks and their descendants pushed their way towards the north, thus finally learning from the natives of Kamchatka about a country across the sea. But it was only in 1741 that an expedition consisting of two ships, "St. Paul" and "St. Peter," was organised with the purpose of exploring the islands and the mainland opposite Kamchatka. Captain Vitus Behring was in charge of the expedition and of the ship "St. Peter." Second in command was Captain Alexis Chirikov, skipper of the "St. Paul." Chirikov was the first to sight the land in the first days of July, 1741. He sent a landing party of ten and, as they did not return, another detachment of six sailors to the shore. None of them were ever seen again. The landings from the other vessel were more successful. The islands Kayak, Kadyak and others were discovered on that voyage, which ended with the wreck of one ship and the death of Captain Behring.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The White Russian group in three of the Western Provinces of the old Russian Empire is a distinctive group in the East Slavonic family.

<sup>2</sup> Bancroft, H. H., *History of Alaska*, 1730-1785. San Francisco, Cal., A. L. Bancroft, 1886, pp. 69-98.

In the following years the newly discovered Aleutian Islands and the mainland of Alaska became a hunting ground for Russian adventurers (*promyshlenniki*), who formed expeditions with the purpose of hunting sea-otter and other fur-bearing animals. Their arrogant and often incredibly cruel attitude towards the native Aleuts caused many bloody encounters, which not seldom ended in massacres of the invaders by the natives or massacre and plunder of whole Aleutian settlements by the *promyshlenniki*.<sup>3</sup>

The Russian fur merchant, Gregory I. Shelikov, was the first to found a permanent colony of Russians on the Island of Kadyak in 1785. Nine years later the first vessel in North-western America was launched in the Voskresensky harbour. In the following year (1795) the first Russian Orthodox Church in America was built in the Pavlovsky harbour on the island of Kadyak. Later on, the scattered settlements were organised into a Russian colony under the Russian-American Company, a semi-official corporation, which was entrusted by the Russian Government with the regulation of trade and administration of Alaska and of the Aleutian Islands. The chief resident-administrator of the colony, Alexander Baranov (1747-1819) founded the settlement of Sitka in 1804. The company remained in charge of Alaska until 1861. In that year the Russian Government took over the whole territory under its direct administration. Six years later the Alaskan possessions were sold to the United States for the sum of \$7,200,000 (1867).<sup>4</sup>

In order to obtain grain and vegetables by independent cultivation instead of by purchase or importation from native Russia, Baranov sent a handful of colonists and Aleuts to the region of Bodega Bay in California and founded there a colony which existed from 1812 to 1841. Because of disagreements with the Mexican Government as to the right of settlement the Russians withdrew, selling their land and buildings in 1841 to a Mexican citizen of Swiss descent, named Sutter. The colony was called Fort Ross. Its site is now maintained as a park by the State of California, with some buildings and the old church still standing.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 99 ff.

<sup>4</sup> See "The Sale of Alaska" by R. Luthin, in this *Review* Vol. XVI, No. 46, 168-182.

<sup>5</sup> There is abundant literature on the subject of Fort Ross. The following are the most important references: Dmitri Zavalishin, "Delo o Kolonii Ross" (About the Colony of Ross), *Russky Vestnik* (Moscow, 1866); P. N. Golovin, *Ueber die Russischen Colonien an der Nordwestküste von America*. (Archiv für wissenschaftliche Kunde von Russland, Berlin, 1863, Vol. 22); R. A. Thompson, *Russian Settlement in California, Fort Ross, Sonoma County*  
[Continued overleaf]

The first order of the Russian Synod, establishing a separate diocese of Kadyak in 1796, was never realised, and in 1811 was revoked. Only in 1840 the Alaskan and Aleutian missions were organised into an independent diocese under Bishop Innokenty (Ioannes Venyaminov). In 1861 the diocese had 7 churches and 35 chapels. "The aggregate capital of the churches exceeded 255,000 rubles."<sup>6</sup> Later on the jurisdiction of the Alaskan-Aleutian Bishop was extended over the whole of North America, and the present Metropolitans of the Russian Orthodox Church in the United States and Canada are considered as successors of Bishop Innokenty.<sup>7</sup>

In general, Alaska was very sparsely colonised by Russians. The population of the territory in 1880 was 33,426, mostly natives.<sup>8</sup> Within a few weeks, or perhaps months, after the transfer there were not more than a dozen Russians left at Sitka,<sup>9</sup> the headquarters of the Russian administration. The rest returned to Russia. 12 Russian Orthodox parishes with 18 churches and 45 chapels attending to the spiritual needs of the natives, halfbreeds and the few descendants of Russian colonists are the main witnesses of the 125 years of the Russian occupation of Alaska.

Many exiles and convicts transported from Siberia to Alaska and to the Aleutian Islands escaped from there to Mexico and later to American California. A Russian traveller of the early seventies reports that many of them formed "artels" (partnerships) and hired themselves as escorts for travellers from California to the East and South. Later on, several hundreds of them became "vaqueros" (cowboys) in the Indian Territory, which in 1907 became the State of Oklahoma.<sup>10</sup>

(San Francisco, 1929); *Quarterly of the California Historical Society*, September, 1933, Vol. XII, no. 3, contains the following articles on the subject: E O Essig, "The Russian Settlement at Ross," pp. 191-209; bibliography relating to the Russians in California, pp. 210-216; A. Ogden, "Russian Sea-Otter and Seal Hunting on the Californian Coast 1803-1841," pp. 217-239; C J DuFour, "The Russian Withdrawal from California," pp. 240-276. See also Bancroft, *op. cit.*, pp. 476-489. Gertrude Atherton's novel "*Rezhanov*" deals with the life of that Russian colony.

<sup>6</sup> Bancroft, *op. cit.*, p. 702.

<sup>7</sup> Rev. Joann Nedzielnicky, "The 140th Anniversary of the Orthodox Faith in America," *Svet* (Wilkes-Barre, Pa.), no. 37-38, 13 and 20 September, 1934; see also scattered information in V. Rev. Peter G. Kohanick, *The Most Useful Knowledge for the Orthodox Russian-American Young People* (published by the author, 136, Hamilton Ave., Passaic, N. J., 1932-34), especially p. 46.

<sup>8</sup> Bancroft, *op. cit.*, p. 711.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 602-3.

<sup>10</sup> A. Kurbsky, *Russky Rabochy u Severo-Amerikanskago Plantatora* (The Russian Worker with a North-American Planter, publ. by A. Homikhovsky, St. Petersburg, 1875), pp. 324-330.



## THE RUSSIANS IN THE UNITED STATES. 641

Political refugees, exiles and escaped convicts have continued to arrive in America from the West up to the present time, although never in great numbers. They settled mainly in San Francisco and tried several times to band into societies.<sup>11</sup> The colony in San Francisco finally grew to a considerable size, especially after the transfer of the See of the Aleutian-Alaskan diocese from Sitka to that city in 1871.

### *Immigration Through the East*

The American immigration authorities listed for the years 1820-1870 only 3,886 immigrants from Russia (the immigrants from Russian Poland were listed separately). Between 1871 and 1880 the same authorities reckoned that 39,284 persons had come to the United States from Russia.<sup>12</sup> How many of them were Russians, and how many Russian Jews, Ukrainians, Lithuanians, Latvians, Estonians, Finns, German Mennonites and others, cannot be ascertained.

The first known Russian immigrant to the Eastern part of North America was Prince Demetrius Augustine Golitsyn, son of the Russian Ambassador to Holland at the end of the eighteenth century. Golitsyn embraced the Roman Catholic faith and came to Maryland on the 28th of October, 1792. He first became a Catholic priest ordained in America and worked as a missionary first in Maryland and then in Pennsylvania, where he bought large tracts of land and settled on it Catholic immigrants. He was disinherited by the Russian Tsar because of his faith. Thanks to his activities many villages were founded in what is today Cambria County. Golitsyn refused elevation to the Bishopric and died in 1841.<sup>13</sup> There is a monument to him in Loretto, Pennsylvania; and Gallitzin in Pennsylvania, as well as Gallitzinville in New York State, are named after him.

Russians are also mentioned in Hartford, Conn. in the Second Census of the United States (1800). Otherwise very little is known

<sup>11</sup> A. Kurbsky, *op. cit.*, pp. 70-72—M. M. Vladimirov, *Russky sredi Amerikhanisev* (The Russian among Americans, St. Petersburg, 1877), pp. 143-145.

<sup>12</sup> *Annual Report of the Commissioner General of Immigration 1930* (United States Department of Labour, Washington, D C, 1930), p. 202.

<sup>13</sup> *Encyclopædia Britannica* (14th ed., 1920), Vol. IX., pp. 986-7; P. R. Radosavljevich, *Who are the Slavs?* (Boston, R. G. Badger, 1919), Vol. I, pp. 161, 216, 423; Vol. II, p. 39. Radosavljevich's work contains valuable biographical and bibliographical mentions of the leading American Slavs (up to 1918).

about the Russians who lived in the eastern sections of the United States before 1870. Outside of a few Russian-sounding names in the lists of American soldiers of the Revolutionary and Civil Wars, only a few personalities can be cited as being of some prominence. A Russian Colonel, who had left Russia for unknown reasons, served under the name of John Basil Turchin as Colonel and afterwards as Brigadier-General with the infantry volunteers from Illinois; he resigned on 2nd of October, 1864,<sup>14</sup> and lived thereafter in Chicago, conducting a real estate business. He founded the town of Radom, Illinois, by settling Polish immigrants on farms.<sup>15</sup>

Andrew Agapiy Honcharenko, who arrived in Boston in 1865, moved in 1867 to San Francisco. Although an Ukrainian, he published the first Russian newspaper in the United States, the *Alaska Herald*, which appeared in Russian and English in San Francisco on 1 March, 1868, was subsidised at the outset by the American government and was intended as a means of enlightening the inhabitants of Alaska about the laws and customs of the United States. The revolutionary and radical spirit of Honcharenko did not permit him to overlook the abuses of the American military administration in the new colony and he criticised them sharply in his newspaper. His subsidy was withdrawn, but for some time he managed to publish his paper without support and was largely instrumental in improving conditions in Alaska.<sup>16</sup>

In 1873 Honcharenko again tried to publish a newspaper, this time in Russian only, named *Svoboda* (Liberty); a few issues appeared in San Francisco in 1873. Some years later, disappointed by the failure of Russians in California to organise a progressive society, Honcharenko retired to a small farm near Hayward, California, where he died at the age of 84 in May, 1916.<sup>17</sup>

Vladimir K. Gayns, Captain of the General Staff of the Imperial Russian Army, resigned his commission and arrived in the United States in 1866 or 1868 for the purpose of putting in practice his humanitarian social ideas, based on the principle of voluntary

<sup>14</sup> Francis B. Heitman, *Historical Register and Dictionary of the United States Army* (Washington, D.C., Government Printing Office, 1903), Vol. I, p. 974.

<sup>15</sup> M. M. Vladimirov, *op. cit.*, pp. 77, 79, 93-95.

<sup>16</sup> Bancroft, *op. cit.*, pp. 602, 608, 648, 677; Ahapiy Honcharenko, *Spomyvky Ukrainshoho Kozaka Svyashchennyka* (Memoirs of an Ukrainian Cossack-Priest), Kolomea, 1894.

<sup>17</sup> Y. Chyz, "Ahapiy Honcharenko," *Almanac of the Ukrainian Working-men's Association* (Scranton, 1935), pp. 112-122.

communism. Under the name of William Frey he tried to organise communes in Kansas and later on in Oregon (New Odessa).<sup>18</sup>

To the same group of idealists belonged the Russian family which under the name of Brooks shared the hardships of Frey and his wife, and also Malikov, who later returned to Russia. Other immigrants of the same type organised in 1870 a short-lived co-operative furniture shop in New York.<sup>19</sup>

Vladimir A. Stoleshnikov, former confederate of the well known Russian revolutionaries Tkachev and Nechayev, was in the 'seventies and 'eighties the leader of the progressive colony in New York. He was an architect and took part in executing plans for the famous Carnegie Hall in New York. He died in Marietta, Ill., in 1907.<sup>20</sup>

One of the founders of the American Socialist Labour Party was a Russian emigré of those times, Sergius E. Shevich. Peter A. Demyanov (Peter Tverskoy, Captain Peter Demens), besides helping his countrymen who, like himself, had to leave Russia because of political persecution, wrote interesting articles on America for Russian magazines and at the same time succeeded as an American business man, coloniser, and railroad builder. He founded the City of Petersburg in Florida. The delegate of the Russian Revolutionary Organisation, "Narodnaya Volya," Leo Hartman, for several years endeavoured to inform the American public on the true state of affairs in Imperial Russia, and lived long enough (he died in 1909 in Florida) to see the first revolutionary upheaval in his country.<sup>21</sup>

### *Causes of Immigration.*

The beginnings of mass-emigration from Russia fell in the times of the reign of Alexander III (1881-1894) when the "exceptional laws" and other forms of persecution, pogroms included, forced thousands of Jews to seek refuge in the New World. A similar persecution of dissenters from the official Russian Orthodox Church and of some of the Protestants caused the emigration of thousands upon thousands of Russian "Dukhobors" and "Molokans,"

<sup>18</sup> Nikolay Slavinsky, *Pisma ob Amerike i Russkikh Pereselentsakh* (Letters about America and Russian Colonists), St. Petersburg, 1873; pp. 295 ff., A. Faresov, "Odn iz Semidesyatnikov," (One of those of the Seventies), in *Vestnik Evropy*, St. Petersburg, 1904, Vol. 229, pp. 225-260. M. Villchur, *Russians in America*, First Russian Publishing Corporation in America, Inc., New York, 1918, pp. 16-20, 36-37.

<sup>19</sup> N. Slavinsky, *op. cit.*, pp. 295, 33; M. A. Faresov, *op. cit.*, *passim*.

<sup>20</sup> Villchur, *op. cit.*, pp. 20-21.

<sup>21</sup> See Villchur, *op. cit.*, pp. 21-28, on Shevich, Demyanov-Tverskoy and Hartman.

Ukrainian "Stundists," White-Russian "Starovery" (Old-Believers), and of the descendants of German Mennonites, who had settled in Russia and Ukraine in the eighteenth century.

The reactionary policy of the Government caused the voluntary exile of hundreds of Social-Democrats, Social-Revolutionaries, Anarchists and other opponents of the Imperial regime. Among them were Leon Trotsky and Nicholas Bukharin, who later became prominent in the Russian Bolshevik upheaval.

The economic conditions in the north-western and western Russian provinces caused the departure of many poor peasants, especially from the White Russian provinces of Grodno, Minsk and Mogilev and from the Ukrainian provinces of Wolyn and Podolia. The semi-feudal system of large estates of Russian and Polish nobles, with diminutive peasant farms around them, caused shortage of land, so that the peasants had to emigrate or starve. Some of them migrated to Siberia and Turkestan, and the more enterprising chose America. During the World War the Russian immigration to the United States ceased almost entirely. The post-war hardships which afflicted all Europe, aggravated in Russia by the revolution and the ruthless dictatorship of the Communist Party, revived the desire of many Russians to come to America. New immigration laws of the United States and their strict enforcement limited the influx of immigrants from Russia to 62,077 in the years 1921-31.<sup>22</sup> In contrast to the mass of pre-war immigrants, the majority of these refugees belong to the educated class. For that reason their presence in the United States became more noticeable than that of the more numerous immigration of the previous decades.

#### STATISTICS

According to the fifteenth census of the United States (1930), 315,721 white persons of foreign birth gave their mother tongue as "Russian." This number, however, does not indicate how many Russians were in America in 1930. The report of the Census Bureau states in its chapter on "Mother Tongue of the Foreign Born White Population" that "many Jews of foreign birth report German, Russian, or other languages as their mother tongue." What the Bureau fails to mention, is the fact that very often the country of origin, in this case, Russia, was listed as "mother tongue," as was the case with the 3,000 Ukrainian Stundists of North Dakota, all of whom are registered as Russians. Furthermore, the local

<sup>22</sup> United States Department of Labor: *Annual Report of the Commissioner General of Immigration*, 1931, United States Government Printing Office, Washington, 1931.

name of Ukrainians from Galicia and Carpathian-Ruthenia—"Rusin" or "Rusnak"—was often put down as Russian, together with those Ukrainians who are politically or culturally Russophils and who list themselves as Russians although they do not speak the Russian language. This accounts for some 39,000 "Russians" from Poland, Czechoslovakia, Austria and Hungary. All the White Russians, who are a separate nationality and constitute now an autonomous Republic in the Soviet Union, were listed also as Russians. Thus the number of Russians must be much smaller than the number of persons who registered their mother tongue as Russian.

This statement is borne out by the statistics of the United States Bureau of Immigration. Between 1899 and 1930, 266,632 Russians arrived in the United States. Between 1908 and 1930, 114,656 Russians departed from America.<sup>23</sup>

Before 1899 no arrivals and before 1908 no departures had been recorded according to the nationality of immigrants. Assuming that in the three previous decades the Russians constituted the same proportion of all arrivals from Russia as in the years 1899-1930, the number 74,327 must be added to the 266,632, making a total of 340,959 immigrants in the period of 50 years. Deducting from this number the 114,656 known departures, we obtain the number of 226,303 as remaining in the United States. The annual average mortality of 13.1 per thousand<sup>24</sup> would leave at the end of 1930 only 89,727 Russians in the United States.

According to the figures of the United States census the children of foreign born parents constitute 127 per cent. of the number of foreign born. The children of mixed parentage constitute 62.5 per cent. Assuming that all children of foreign parentage and half of those of mixed parentage retain their connection with their cultural group, we obtain the number of 231,719 as the estimated total of the first and second generation of Russians in the United States in 1930.<sup>25</sup>

<sup>23</sup> According to the official U.S. figures, the following numbers left America since 1920 "by countries of intended future permanent residence": Russia in our case: 1920, 1,933; 1921, 15,229; 1922, 6,407; 1923, 2,434; 1924, 572; 1925, 539; 1926, 181; 1927, 239; 1928, 426; 1929, 314; 1930, 256; 1931, 433; 1932, 1,524; 1933, 515; 1934, 218; 1935, 162.

<sup>24</sup> This average is calculated on the basis of the death rate per thousand of the population of the United States for the years 1910-1930. See *World Almanac* 1936 (New York; World Telegram, 1936), p. 271.

<sup>25</sup> Other estimates are Isaac A. Hourvich, "Russkoe Naselenie Soyed., Shtatov" (The Russian Population in the United States), *Na Chuzhbyne* (New York), Nov., 1914, estimated the number of the first and second generation Russians, on the basis of the U.S. Census of 1913, at 100,000; Villchur, *op. cit.*, pp. 59-60 and J. Davis, *The Russians and Ruthenians in America* (New

## CHURCH

The Russian Orthodox Church is the largest religious organisation of the Russian immigration in America. It was established first in 1792 in Alaska and spread first in that part of America.<sup>26</sup> The first Russian Orthodox parish in the East was organised in 1876, in New York with a former Catholic priest of Danish nationality Rev. Nicholas Bjerring, as incumbent. In 1872 the See was removed from Sitka to San Francisco, where a cathedral was built. Still the Church did not grow and the United States Bureau of Census reported in 1890 only 500 members of that denomination. E. N. Matrosov<sup>27</sup> states that around the year of 1896 there were in America "some 20,000 Orthodox Christians of various national and even racial origin."

In 1891 the Russian Orthodox Mission started proselytising among the Greek-Catholic Ukrainians (Ruthenians) from Galicia and the northern part of Hungary with such success that by July 1917, 169 parishes had been organised among the former Greek Catholics.<sup>28</sup> It was chiefly due to the influence of that church that a part of the Ukrainian immigrants in America still call themselves Russians. The proselytising was made easy for the Russian church by the Irish Catholic bishops, who treated with malice and intolerance those faithful to another rite and their priests.<sup>29</sup> At the present time, some 80 per cent. of the membership of the "Russian Orthodox Church" consists of former Ukrainian Greek Catholics or Orthodox Ukrainians from the territories of the former Russian Empire.

In 1926 the Russian Orthodox Church reported 199 churches with 95,134 members, including infants and children.<sup>30</sup> In 1935, according to the official publication of the same Church, this religious

York: G. H. Doran, 1922), p. 21, estimated that 192,920 Russians lived in America in July, 1917; Davis states that "The Inter-Racial Council and the head of the New York City work for foreigners of the Y.M.C.A. estimate that there are at least 400,000 Russians in America, while Dr. Hourvich, an authority in immigration, places the number below 300,000." See also: V. V. Obolensky-Osinsky, "Emigration from and Immigration into Russia," in W. F. Wilcox, Ed., *International Migrations* (New York: National Bureau of Economic Research, 1931), pp. 521-580.

<sup>26</sup> More details can be found in: U.S., *Census of Religious Bodies* 1926 "Eastern Orthodox Churches" (Washington, D.C., 1929), pp. 34-35.

<sup>27</sup> E. N. Matrosov (Count Lelva): "Zaokeanskaya Rus," (The Russia beyond the Ocean) in *Istorichesky Vestnik*, St. Petersburg, 1897, Vol. 68, p. 411.

<sup>28</sup> Rev. P. Kohanick, "Pravoslavnaya Tserkov vo Vselennoy" (The Orthodox Church in the Universe), in the *Almanac of the Russian Orthodox Mutual Aid Society for the Year 1936* (Wilkes-Barre, Pa., 1936), p. 112.

<sup>29</sup> The Uniats acknowledge the Pope as the head of the Christian Church, but are allowed to worship in the Orthodox way, which was accepted by the Pope under the title "the Eastern rite."

<sup>30</sup> U.S. *Census of Religious Bodies in 1926*.

organisation increased to 238 churches in the United States, 18 churches and 45 chapels in Alaska and 45 churches in Canada, with 283 members of the clergy and 328,000 members.<sup>31</sup> Regardless of the improbability of so rapid a growth of the Church (over 232,000 new members in nine years, while between 1916-1926 a decrease of over 4,500 members was reported), the above statement does not conform to the opinion of Mr. M. Villchur, an outstanding authority on Russian immigration in America, who writes that "scattered throughout the country are some two hundred Russian churches mostly small, whose clergy eke out a scant existence."<sup>32</sup> It is much safer to assume that the growth of the Russian Church during the last nine years was much slower and that its membership in the United States does not exceed 140,000 members, including non-Russians. N. K. Komyakov states that the Russian Church in the United States and Canada has some 300 parishes. Through them it has contacts and extends its Russian influence at least over some 60,000 Russian colonists.<sup>33</sup>

The Russian Orthodox Church has been in a state of turmoil during the last twenty years. First there was a movement to set up churches which would be independent from the Holy Synod in Russia. The movement, under the leadership of the Reverend Peshkov, made considerable progress, especially during the World War. Then some of the newly converted Greek Catholics demanded a larger share of influence in the affairs of the Church and established an independent diocese. Finally, the adherents of the old hierarchy did not recognise bishops consecrated under the Communist rule. Not until November, 1934, have almost all the factions ironed out their difference at a congress held in Cleveland and accepted a new scheme of organisation, with a Metropolitan for the United States and Canada, and ten Dioceses each headed by a Bishop or Archbishop. The See of the Metropolitan is in New York and in San Francisco. Diocesan Bishops have their Cathedrals in New York, Philadelphia, Boston (temporarily in New York), Pittsburgh, Detroit (two), Chicago, San Francisco, Sitka and Montreal.<sup>34</sup>

<sup>31</sup> Kohanick, "Pravoslavnyaya Tserkov . . ." in *op. cit.*, p. 143. This annual publication of the periodical *Svit* (The Light), 84, East Market St., Wilkes-Barre, Pennsylvania, contains the addresses of the parishes of the Russian Orthodox Church, as well as those of the Greek, Syrian, Serbian, Albanian, and Ukrainian Orthodox Dioceses of North and some of South and Central America.

<sup>32</sup> Villchur, "Russians in the United States," F. L. I. S., New York, 1935.

<sup>33</sup> N. K. Komyakov, "The Russian Colony and its Future," in *The Jubilee Book of the Nauka Society* (New York), November, 1935, p. 31.

<sup>34</sup> Kohanick, *op. cit.*, p. 121.

Russian parishes often maintain schools for children in which they teach them the native language. In most of them a somewhat antiquated form of Ukrainian is taught, although the teachers call it Russian or Little-Russian. According to a contributor to the newspaper *Pravda*,<sup>35</sup> literary Russian is taught in some ten schools only. Another contributor explains that in schools "where the young teachers teach in literary Russian, the children know nothing, and the schools of such young teachers cannot be considered schools at all." Therefore, it is necessary to conduct the schools in "Little-Russian."

#### MOLOKANS AND DUKHOBORS

A goodly number of Russian immigrants in the United States belong to various "Dissident" groups. The most numerous of these are the "Molokans." They have been persecuted by the Russian Government for their refusal to conform to the dogmas and rites of the Orthodox Church, and for that reason they decided to look for a country outside Russia. They sent two delegations to Canada, who did not select any site there but recommended California. In 1903-1906 several thousand Molokans and other sectarians settled in Los Angeles, San Francisco, and other Californian towns.<sup>36</sup> The Molokans are divided into several sects, such as "pure Molokans," "postoyannye" (the steady ones), "Priguny" (jumpers), "sopuny" (breathers), and others. The older generation strives to lead the simple life according to its understanding of the Scriptures. The younger people, however, are strongly influenced by American cultural environment.

The members of another ancient Russian sect, the "Dukhobors" (Wrestlers of the Spirit), emigrated at the end of the 19th century to Canada. During the following years many of them settled in the United States, forming larger communities in Los Angeles, Chico, San Diego, California; Chicago, Illinois; Detroit, Michigan, and other places. The Chicago Russian daily *Rassvet* conducts a

<sup>35</sup> *Pravda*, semi-weekly, published by the Russian Brotherhood Organisation, Philadelphia, Pa., No. 43 of 5 June, 1936, and No. 56 of 21 July, 1936.

<sup>36</sup> The literature on the Molokans is quite extensive. For the Molokans in America, see: J. Davis, *op. cit.*, pp. 80-82; M. Villchur, *Russians in America*, pp. 46-51; L. Sokolov, *The Russians in Los Angeles* (Los Angeles, Cal., University of Southern California, Studies in Sociology, Vol. III, No. 3, 1919); P. V. Young, *The Pilgrims of Russian Town* (Chicago), 1932; and "Family Organisation of the Molokans," *Sociology and Social Research*, Sept.-Oct., 1927, Vol. XII, pp. 54-60; and "Occupational Attitudes and Values of Russian Lumber Workers," *ibid.*, July-August, 1928, Vol. XII, pp. 543-53; and "The Russian Molokan Community in Los Angeles," *American Journal of Sociology*, 1929-30, Vol. XXXV, pp. 393-402.



special page for them. They have a trend to settle on farms and they consider their occasional work in cities as temporary.<sup>37</sup>

The Old Believers settled in the vicinity of Pittsburgh (town of Essen). They came to the United States mainly from the province of Suwalki (now in Poland). Most of them live in the Alleghany County in Pennsylvania.<sup>38</sup> Two other sectarian groups from former Russia, the so-called "Stundists" from Ukraine<sup>39</sup> and the German Mennonites,<sup>40</sup> do not belong to the Russian racial cultural group and are sometimes erroneously counted as a part of the "Russian" immigration. They hardly participate in any way in the Russian group life in America.

In addition to these purely Russian churches and denominations, several thousands of Russians belong to various Protestant churches, with which they became affiliated after their arrival in the United States. The United States Census of Religious Bodies of 1916 lists the following Protestant and Evangelical Churches with Russian membership :

1916						
Baptists	...	...	4	Russian	.	4 mixed
Disciples of Christ	...	...	4	"	...	I "
Seventh Day Adventists	...	...	4	"	...	I "
Methodist Episcopal	..	..	I	"	..	I "
Presbyterian	...	...	I	"	...	I "
Mennonites	...	...	I	"	..	—
Protestant Episcopal	...	...	..	..	...	I "
Church of Christ	...	...	..	..	...	I "

<sup>37</sup> See : J. Davis, *op. cit.*, p. 80; Villchur, *op. cit.*, pp. 47-48; V. G. Chertkov Ed., *Christian Martyrdom in Russia. Persecution of the Spirit-Wrestlers (or Dukhoboritsky) in the Caucasus* (London: Brotherhood Co., 1897); W. Bienstock, "L'emigration de Dukhobors," *La Revue Blanche*, 1900, XXIII: 431-435; O. Mamde, *A Peculiar People: The Dukhobors* (New York: Funk & Wagnalls, 1904); O. Palmieri, "The Russian Dukhobors and their Religious Teachings," *Harvard Theological Review*, 1915, III: 62-81.

<sup>38</sup> Alexis Sokolov, "Old Believers. Mediæval Russia in the Pittsburgh District," *Survey*, 1914-15, Vol. 33, pp. 145-50.

<sup>39</sup> For the "Stundists" see : Villchur, *op. cit.*, pp. 40-45; A. Dubowoy & Y. J. Chyz, "Ukrainian Colonies in North Dakota (Shtoondesty)" in the *Almanac of the Ukrainian Workingmen's Association*, 1936 (Scranton, Pa.), pp. 137-175.

<sup>40</sup> See : P. Isaak, "Russian Mennonites," *Russian Student* (New York), December, 1929, no. 4, VI: 14-15; G. Leibbrandt, "The Emigration of German Mennonites from Russia to the United States and Canada, in 1873-1880," *The Mennonite Quarterly Review* (Goshen College, Goshen, Indiana), 1932, Vol. VI-VII; pp. 205-26; 5-41; C. H. Smith, *The Coming of the Russian Mennonites. An Episode in the Settling of the Last Frontier, 1874-84* (Indiana Berne, 1927); "The Volga Germans in America," *Interpreter*, May, 1925, no. 5, IV: 10-11.

## OCCUPATION

The Russian immigrants before the World War were mainly peasants. Some authors estimate that as many as 92 per cent. of them left their villages because of an unequal distribution of land.<sup>41</sup> Many of them tried to establish themselves on farms and in farmers' colonies. Only the sectarians such as the Molokans and the Dukhobors have succeeded in maintaining their colonies in California. Others farm singly or in small groups attached to towns and boroughs in South Dakota, Texas, Colorado, Wisconsin, Pennsylvania, New York, New Jersey, Massachusetts and Connecticut. In many of these settlements they live side by side with Ukrainian immigrants from Galicia and Carpathian Ruthenia, and sometimes with Polish farmers. There are about 30,000 Russians engaged in the cultivation of farm land in the United States.<sup>42</sup>

The majority of Russian immigrants work in American industries in large cities like New York, Chicago, Detroit, San Francisco, Los Angeles, Gary, and in coal mines and steel works in Pennsylvania, Ohio and West Virginia. Russian labourers can be found in lumber areas of Washington and Michigan, in fisheries on the Pacific coast and such industries as tailoring, house-wrecking and restaurant work. There are Russian, Russian-Ukrainian and Russian-Polish union branches of cloak-makers, stevedores, window-cleaners, house-wreckers in New York and of mechanics in New York, Philadelphia, New Haven, Chicago, Bridgeport and San Francisco.

The post-war immigrants, mostly members of the intelligentsia and of the former Imperial Russian Army, found the process of social adjustment very hard at the beginning of their new careers;<sup>43</sup> but, with the passing of a few years, several of them have risen to desirable positions. Many of them are still taxi drivers, waiters, watchmen, and manual labourers, although they are graduates of Russian universities or former officers of high rank in the Imperial Army.

## ORGANISATIONS

The Russian immigrants have shown very little inclination for organised social life on a larger scale. Many of their associations have been of short duration and very few of them have succeeded

<sup>41</sup> L. G. Brown, *Immigration* (New York: Longmans, Green, 1933), p. 151.

<sup>42</sup> M. Villchur, "The Russian Group in America," *Interpreter*, July, 1925, No. 7, IV: 9-12.

<sup>43</sup> George M. Day, "Russian Student Traits," *Sociology and Social Research*, Sept., 1929, Vol. XIV, 30-34; and *The Russians in Hollywood* (Los Angeles, Cal., 1934); unsigned, "Some Russian Novelties," *Interpreter*, August, 1924, No. 8, Vol. III, pp. 9-12.

## THE RUSSIANS IN THE UNITED STATES. '651

in binding together a few thousands of members for any long period of time. Even the largest Russian organisation—the Russian Orthodox Church—grew and assumed an organised form only because a majority of its membership is composed of non-Russian former Greek Catholics.

The first Russian society in America, "The Association of Decembrists" (so named in memory of the first liberal uprising in December, 1825) was founded in 1867 by A. Honcharenko, an Ukrainian priest, in San Francisco. It became later the Russian and Pan-Slavic Society, and then was wrecked by the opposition of the official representatives in Washington.<sup>44</sup> The more progressive members, however, maintained the organisation secretly for some time afterwards, helping escaped convicts and political exiles from Siberia.

Another short-lived society, the Russian Circle of Mutual Aid, was founded in New York in March, 1872, with I. P. Volkov as President, M. S. Betanelli as Secretary, and I. A. Dobrolyubov as Treasurer.<sup>45</sup> In the 'eighties many societies were founded in New York by Russians and Russian Jews, chiefly for the purpose of helping new immigrants. These organisations took the form of local associations of immigrants from Moscow, St. Petersburg, Kovno, Minsk, Bialystok, Wilna, Harkov, and other cities of the Russian Empire. They helped their countrymen to find work, learn the language and adopt themselves to American conditions.

The Russian Social-Democratic Society, founded in New York in 1891, soon established its branches or affiliated societies in Brooklyn, Philadelphia, Baltimore, Waterbury, Pittsburgh, Homestead, Boston, Providence and Bayonne. Out of that group of societies grew the Russian Federation of the Socialist Party of America, which had 40 branches by 1918. In 1917-18 the Russian Federation split into groups: one joined the Communist Party, where today it constitutes its Russian Section, and the other remained in the Socialist Party. The Federation of Russian Workers, an Anarchist association, had in 1918 fourteen branches in nine eastern states and in Oregon among the lumber jacks.<sup>46</sup>

<sup>44</sup> A. Honcharenko, *Memours*.

<sup>45</sup> Nicholas Slavinsky, *op. cit.*, p. 299. The Society was located at 36, Delancey, New York City.

<sup>46</sup> Several societies helped the political prisoners and exiles in Imperial Russia, especially after the revolution in 1905 and the ensuing reaction of 1908 and later years. Many local associations served the Russian immigrant as a kind of evening school with lectures, courses and discussions. Such societies existed in Ansonia, Connecticut, Albany, New York, Chicago and other places

In 1918 an attempt was made to unite all Russian societies. This endeavour by the All-American Russian Congress resulted in two conventions: one composed of the delegates from the Anarchist and Communist organisations, and the other from the more conservative groups. The first convention ended in the formation of the Federation of Russian Socialist Societies, which was in reality a Communist group, opposed by the Anarchists; the second convention created the shortlived Federation of Russian Organisations.

One of the oldest existing Russian societies, the "Nauka" (Knowledge), was founded in 1905 in New York, and has not only succeeded in maintaining its existence for over thirty years but also in 1926 gave the initiative to the formation of the "Russkoe Obedinennoe Obshchestvo Vzaimopomoshchi v Amerike" (The Russian Consolidated Mutual Aid Society, or, shortly, ROOVA), a fraternal organisation. The former conducts a school for the children of Russian immigrants in New York, arranges lectures for adult members and owns a building at 315 East 10 Street, New York City.<sup>47</sup>

Besides ROOVA, which on 31 December, 1935, had 2,423 members,<sup>48</sup> the Russian Independent Mutual Aid Society of Chicago had 1,245 adult and 257 juvenile members (on 31 December, 1935). The Russian National Mutual Aid Society, with its headquarters in Philadelphia, founded in 1920, had 6,884 adult and 1,136 juvenile members on 31 December, 1934; it joined the Russian Section of the International Workers' Order in December, 1935.<sup>49</sup>

The post-war immigrants, who are mostly refugees from the Soviet régime and belong to the educated classes, organise often with the purpose to preserve the memories of pre-revolutionary Russia, regardless of their present occupation. Thus we hear of the Society of the Russian Imperial Guard, the Saint Andrew's Cross Society, the Russian Navy Officers' Group, the Cossack "Stanitsas" (Posts) and various circles of the former Russian aristocracy, like the Russian Nobility Association of New York City (Ritz Carlton Hotel). Some groups of Russian professional men have organised societies with the purpose of furthering their occupational interests. Thus the

<sup>47</sup> E. A. Moskov, Ed., *Yubileyny Sbornik k Tridesyatiletu Obshchestva "Nauka"* (The Jubilee Book of the Nauka Society), New York, November, 1935.

<sup>48</sup> *The Fraternal Compend Digest* 1936 (published jointly by Taylor, Bird & Co., Cedar Rapids, Iowa, and the National Underwriter Co., Cincinnati, O.), p. 247.

<sup>49</sup> A letter of P. Skipka of the International Workers' Order of the 16 July, 1936, to Mr. Roucek.

Russian Physicians' Society, the Russian Lawyers' Association, the Union of Russian Painters and Artists, the Society of Friends of Russian Culture, and others have come into existence.<sup>50</sup> But it must be noticed that the membership in these associations is not limited to Russians alone. Georgians, Ukrainians, Russian Jews, and even Russian Germans participate in the activities of these organisations.<sup>51</sup> Some of them have become quite important, for instance, the Russian Medical Society in New York had, in 1931, 140 members, and the Fund for the Relief of Men of Letters and Scientists of Russia, organised in 1918 by a Socialist, General K. M. Oberuchev, has distributed over \$60,000 among needy Russian writers.<sup>52</sup>

### PRESS

The above-mentioned semi-monthly *Alaska Herald*, which for some time had also the subtitle of *Svoboda* (Liberty) and which was published by the Reverend Ahapiy Honcharenko in San Francisco in 1868-69 in Russian and in English, was the first Russian newspaper in America. It was revived under the Russian name *Svoboda* in 1873. In 1878 the Russian Orthodox Church in New York started *The Oriental Church Magazine* (*Zhurnal Vostochnoy Tserkvi*) which existed for about two years.<sup>53</sup> Later, in the 'eighties, the weekly *Znamya* (The Flag) made its appearance. It became the organ of the Russian revolutionaries with socialist leanings and published articles by such known personalities of the anti-Tsarist revolutionary movement as P. Lavrov, G. V. Plekhanov, Vera Zazulich and P. Akselrod. It expired in 1892.

Seven newspapers, five of which were weeklies, were published in the 'nineties; nine publications were started in the first decade of the 20th century. None of them, however, survived, with the exception of the *Russko-Amerykanskyy Pravoslavny Vestnik* (The Russian-American Orthodox Messenger), the official organ of the Russian Orthodox Church, which was published first in 1895 and then appeared, with intermissions, from 1899 to 1915, and is still published.

<sup>50</sup> M. Villchur, "Russians in the United States," and "Among the Russians," *The Interpreter*, Feb., 1925, No. 2, IV. 8-11.

<sup>51</sup> Several large fraternal organisations, which have in their names the word "Russian," are really maintained by Russophil Ukrainians, or by immigrants from Carpathian Ruthenia who sometimes call themselves Carpatho-Russians. Such organisations are not dealt with in our account.

<sup>52</sup> Venyamin D. Krymski, Compiler, *Russian American Guide* (New York), V. Martianov & L. Kamysnikov, 1931, pp. 77-80.

<sup>53</sup> A. P. Lopukhin, *Zhizn za Okeanom* (Life Beyond the Ocean), St. Petersburg, 1882, pp. 181, ff.

Mr. Villchur lists in his *Russians in America* thirty-four publications for the period from 1910-1918, but only a few are still in existence. The following list of the most important Russian newspapers in America in 1936 is probably not complete; if that is the case, the omitted publications, if any, must be of a very local character and thus have escaped our careful inquiries:

*Dailies:*

1. *Novoe Russkoe Slovo* (The New Russian Word), established as *Russkoe Slovo* in 1910. Novoe Russkoe Slovo Publ. Corp., 413 E. 14 Street, New York City.
2. *Russky Golos* (Russian Voice), since 1917, Russky Golos Publ. Co., 64 E. 7 Street, New York City.
3. *Novy Mir* (The New World), since 1911 and then again since 1927. Russwordal Publ. Co., 58 E. 13 Street, New York City.
4. *Rassvet* (The Dawn), since 1917, Russian Publ. Co., 1722 West Chicago Ave., Chicago, Ill.
5. *Rossiya* (Russia) since 1932, Rossiya Publ. Co., 480 Canal Street, New York City.
6. *Novaya Zarya* (The New Dawn), since 1927, G. T. Sohkov, 2078 Sutter Street, San Francisco, Cal.

*Weeklies and Monthlies:*

7. *Russky Vestnik* (The Russian Herald), semi-monthly, since 1933, The Russian Consolidated Mutual Aid Society of America and the Federated Russian-American Youth, 405 E. 22 St., New York City.
8. *Russkoe Obozrenie* (Russian Review), weekly since 1927. The Russian Review Publ. Co., 2117 W. Grant Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
9. *Russko-Amerikansky' Pravoslavny Vestnik* (The Russian-American Orthodox Messenger), organ of the Metropolitan Diocese of the Russian Orthodox Church in America since 1905. Editor: Rev. Theophan Buketov, 3333-70 Street, Jackson Heights, N.Y.
10. *Probuzhdenie* (Awakening), monthly, 9219 Russel St., Detroit, Mich.
11. *Zemlya Kolumba* (The Land of Columbus), monthly magazine of literature, art and Russian life in America. Editor: W. Miklashovsky, 625 Market Street, San Francisco, Cal.
12. *Chasovoy* (The Sentinel), monthly organ of former Russian soldiers, Chicago, Ill.
13. *Bich* (The Whip), monthly, humour and satire, New York City.
14. *Russkaya Zhizn* (Russian Life), weekly, 1367 Valencia Street, San Francisco, Cal.
15. *Gudok* (The Whistle).
16. *The Russian Orthodox Journal* (published in English with four Russian pages), monthly, since 1927. The Federated Russian Orthodox Clubs, 517 Ottawa Avenue, Grand Rapids, Mich.

Four newspapers of Russophil Ukrainians—the *Svit* (weekly, Wilkes-Barre, Pa.), the *Pravda* (bi-weekly, Philadelphia, Pa.), the *Vostok* (weekly, Perth Amboy, N. J.), and the *Karpatorusskoe Slovo*

(semi-monthly, New York)—publish articles in Russian alongside with articles in a dialect of Ukrainian and in a Russian-Ukrainian jargon.

The Russian Archdiocese also publishes books and pamphlets in various languages, chiefly Russian.

#### RUSSIAN CONTRIBUTION TO AMERICAN CULTURE

The primary contribution of Russian immigrants to American life is the work of the thousands of Russian labourers in almost every industry. Together with American and immigrant workers of other nationalities, they have helped to build up this country to what it is today. Russian and Ukrainian farmers, furthermore, brought with them numerous varieties of seeds, which proved very suitable to the American climate and soil and which are now widely used by American agriculturists. "Beardless Fife," "Kubanka," "Crimean," "Arnautka," "Harkov," "Malakov," and other kinds of wheat are used extensively in agricultural middle-western states. Kherson oats are now planted in Iowa, Illinois, Kansas, Nebraska and the southern part of Wisconsin. Rye, buckwheat, alfalfa, sunflowers, millet and other seeds found their way from Russian Ukraine, the Volga and Kuban regions and from Turkestan to the American prairies of the Middle West together with Russian Molokans and Dukhobors, German Mennonites and Ukrainian Stundists.<sup>54</sup>

"Russian contributions to American cultural and spiritual life are twofold. Some of them are, so to say, as of international nature and would have been made without the arrival of Russian immigrants in the United States. The music of Chaikovsky and Glinka, the works of Tolstoy, Dostoyevsky, Gogol and Chekhov, the scientific contributions of Mendeleyev, Mechnikov and Pavlov have found their way into American cultural life regardless of Russian immigration. The same can be said of the dancers, Pavlova, Nizhinsky, and Fokin; the singers, Shalyapin, Baklanov and Lipkovskaya; the actors, Nazimova, Bakkanova and Balejev, and scores of others who have entertained the American public and influenced American art.

"On the other hand, the direct influence of Russian immigration cannot be overlooked. The progressive movement in the United States, especially its Socialist wing, has been vigorously supported

<sup>54</sup> D. Borodin, "Russian Contributions to Agriculture in America," in *The Guide Book to the Exhibit of Russian Section* (New York: America's Making, 1921), pp. 28-31.

by political émigrés from Russia in the last two decades of the 19th century, such as Sergius Shevich, one of the founders of the Socialist Labour Party, Leo Hartman and Maurice Hillquit. Later, Leon Trotsky, Nicholas Bukharin and others laid the foundations for the communist movement in the United States."<sup>55</sup>

The persecutions conducted by the former Imperial and the present Soviet Governments caused the influx of numerous Russian scientists, artists and men of letters into America. They brought with them their scientific knowledge and training, their wit and their art. The "Chauve-Souris" almost became an all-American play, "The Wooden Soldiers" and "Ochi Chorniya" almost became American folk songs like the "Volga Boatman"; the well-known melodies of the "Prisoner's Song" and the "Isle of Capri" are said to be but lyrical transpositions of Russian army songs. There is not a day in a week without a Russian programme with works of Russian composers and Russian songs on the radio. American museums are being enriched with canvases of Russian painters and works of Russian sculptors who made their homes in America.<sup>56</sup> We may even on incomplete data list as many as 127 names of Russian scholars in many fields and Russian artists of various kinds who are now at work in the United States, and they include some outstanding figures in Russian learning; for instance, the famous archæologist, Professor Michael Rostovtsev, Professor George Vernadsky of Yale and Professor Paul Haensel of the North Western University, Chicago.

Another mark of Russian influence upon American cultural life is to be found in the numerous works of Russian authors, translated into English and published in the United States and works of Russian immigrant authors, written and published in America.<sup>57</sup>

<sup>55</sup> Quoted from Yaroslav J. Chyz and Joseph S. Roucek: "Russian Americans" in Francis J. Brown and J. S. Roucek *Our Racial and National Minorities*, Prentice-Hall Inc., New York, 1937, pp. 208-209.

<sup>56</sup> The authors express their thanks to Mr. Villchur, The Foreign Language Information Service, for his numerous suggestions on this and other points.

<sup>57</sup> See: *Catalogue of Books Available in English by Russians and on Russia. Published in the United States* (Edited and published by Nicholas N. Martyanov, 16, East 98 St., New York City, 1936); *Research Bulletin on the Soviet Union* (The American Russian Institute, 56, West 45 St., New York City), Vol. I, No. 1, 15 January, 1936, pp. 6-8, "List of Books on the Soviet Union Published in the United States in 1935" For outstanding Russian artists, see: *An Almanac of Russian Artists in America* (N. M. Martyanov, New York City, 1932), Vol. I. Grand Duchess Marie, *Education of a Princess* (New York, Viking, 1931) and *A Princess in Exile* (New York, Viking, 1932), best sellers for a while, are useful works showing the attitudes of certain American classes



The works of Professors Florinsky, Pasvolsky, Sorokin, Roerich, Rostovtsev, Vernadsky and others, too numerous to mention, show the remarkable contribution of the Russian immigrant mind to America.

#### RUSSIAN NAMES IN AMERICA

The influence of Russian immigration and the mark it has left in America can to a certain degree be ascertained from the names of localities derived from the names of Russian communities, provinces and rivers. It may be assumed that not all names of Russian character have been given to these localities by Russian settlers, and that there are localities which have Russian names but no Russian colony and never had any, but which, nevertheless, are called "Petersburg" or "Moscow." On the other hand, some towns with American or other names, such as Loretto, Pennsylvania, or Radom, Illinois, have been founded by Russians—Loretto by D. A. Golitsyn (Gallitzin), Radom by General J. B. Turchin. Mr. Villchur has compiled the following list of names of the former Russian Empire which have been transplanted to America :

State	
Arkansas	Moscow.
California	Fort Ross (now a state park); Mt. Helen (named either after the Princess Helen Pavlova Gagarin who is said to have ascended that mountain with the first exploring party in 1841, or after some Russian Grand Duchess).
Delaware	Odessa.
Florida	Odessa, St. Petersburg (founded by P. E. Demyanov-Tverskoy, known in America as Captain Peter Demens).
Illinois	Alexis, Petersburg.
Indiana	Petersburg, Russiaville, Siberia.
Idaho	Moscow, Volga (founded by the Russian-German Mennonites).
Kansas	Moscow.
Kentucky	Moscow, Petersburg, Volga, Ivan, Olga.
Michigan	Lake Odessa, Petersburg, Moscow.
Louisiana	Ivan, Olga.
Mississippi	Sebastopol.
Minnesota	Odessa.

toward a titled immigrant. Grand Duke Alexander's *Always a Grand Duke* (New York, Farrar, 1933) is composed of some delightful comments on American-Russian immigrants. Frequent magazine and newspaper articles about the "marrying Mdivanis" ought to be consulted on the ways and means whereby doubtful nobility titles are sold to American heiresses; see, for instance, Mary McCormic, "My Prince Mdivani and I," *Liberty*, 7 October, 1933, Vol. X: pp. 7-13.

Missouri	Moscow Mills, Odessa.
Montana	Kremlin, Russ.
New York	Gallitzinville, New Russia, Petersburg.
Nebraska	Odessa, Petersburg.
North Carolina	Odessa
North Dakota	Odessa, Petersburg.
Ohio	Moscow, Petersburg, New Petersburg.
Oklahoma	Kremlin.
Pennsylvania	Gallitzin, Moscow, Petersburg, St. Petersburg.
South Carolina	Lugoff.
South Dakota	Tolstoy, Volga.
Tennessee	Moscow, Petersburg
Texas	Moscow, Odessa, Petersburg, Ivan, Malakoff, Chita, Dobrovolsky.
Vermont	Moscow.
Virginia	Petersburg.
Washington	Odessa, Volga.
West Virginia	Petersburg, Odessa, Volga, Czar, Ivan.
Wisconsin	Petersburg.

## THE AMERICAN-BORN GENERATION

Like every other immigrant group, the Russians find it difficult to maintain their cultural inheritance in full when they are confronted with the "Americanising" influence of their environment. This influence is marked in their children. This inroad of Americanism is evidenced by the fact that the organ of a nation-wide association of young people's societies known as the Federation of Russian Orthodox Clubs publishes *The Russian Orthodox Journal* monthly in English in Grand Rapids, Michigan.

YAROSLAV J. CHYZ  
JOSEPH SLABEY ROUCEK.

## THE HOME OF THE LAST TSAR

### AS MATERIAL FOR A STUDY OF CHARACTER.

HOUSES, furniture, separate articles, can be just as much documents as memoirs, letters and sayings. Their language is not always clear, but then human speech itself is rarely so direct and truthful as not to require study and the discovery of the real meaning. This documental character of things was the reason why it was decided to preserve the personal apartments of the last Romanovs, which in no way were distinguished for their artistic value. After the Revolution they were turned into museums, as historical monuments of a given period.

Such apartments belonging to Nicholas II and his family were to be found in Tsarskoe Selo, in Peterhof, and in the Winter Palace. In the first two of these Imperial residences they have been preserved to the present time; in the Winter Palace they were cleared with the personal apartments of Alexander II not very long ago—at the latest in 1928. One of the reasons for this was the visit of the then Khan of Afghanistan, Amanulla, for whom it was thought desirable to prepare a genuine palace as accommodation for the time of his stay in Leningrad.

Tsarskoe Selo was the main point of concentration of monarchy and court at the time of Elizabeth, daughter of Peter the Great, especially famous under Catherine II, and it continued to be regarded as the principal Imperial residence to the last days of monarchy. Its enormous palace, with its unending series of gilt chambers, its gallery of mirrors, copied from Versailles of the time of Louis XIV, its walls inlaid with amber and agate covered with Chinese silks and French tapestry, presented a kind of symbolic dwelling of the Russian monarchs; but from the death of Catherine the Great no one lived there. This "Great Palace" was in place when Empresses appeared out of the gilt depths of the long line of rooms in a blaze of brocade and diamonds, and hardly seemed earthly beings: when that fantastic luxury which Catherine called "*le luxe enragé*" seemed to be one of the supports of the throne.

From Alexander I, the Romanovs came to regard this palatial magnificence as a burdensome survival to which they turned only on special stately occasions. The imposing halls were empty for months, while their owners furnished for themselves smaller accommodation in one of the wings, or built dwellings of a less

pretentious kind. Thus, with Nicholas I the residence was the so-called "cottage" at Peterhof; with Alexander II, the "farm"; Alexander III chose the service floors of the Palace of Gatchina with such small rooms, crowded with furniture, that it was difficult to turn round in them, and he himself could almost reach the ceiling with his hand.

From the human point of view it is quite intelligible that life in a palace was difficult and uncomfortable, but for the history of a dynasty it is extremely significant that the weaker its position became, the farther the sovereigns retired into their private lives, indulged their personal tastes and removed themselves from their public magnificence—the more they lost in real influence and power.

Nicholas II grew up in Gatchina, which suited him with its homeliness and comfort. His youthful years passed as with the majority of the "gilded youth" of that time. "Had a jolly good dinner and a real merry evening" he enters in his diary for 12 January, 1890; "Danced heartily at the Vorontsevs." In his notes on 17 January, "Dined with the Cavalry Guards; Magyar singers, gipsies"; 18 January, "Fast drive along the quay on the way home." The same year comes his first disappointment. His father ordered him to break with Kshesinskaya; this was done very quickly indeed. 30 July, "Talked with little Kshesinskaya through the window." 31 July, "Said goodbye to Kshesinskaya." 1 August he writes, "Standing in the theatre worried me with my memories." Soon his attention and his heart had already been drawn away to "Alix," who, that same year, stayed with Elizabeth Fedorovna in Ilyinskoe, where his aunt cleverly drew them together in spite of the opposition of his father and mother.<sup>1</sup>

In his day-to-day life he was able to realise the charm of his home—"I was glad to wake up in my cosy bedroom at Gatchina" (3 October, 1890), or when he has got back from a journey abroad: "How good it is to live at home" (3 January, 1892), and in the same way in marriage he looked not for an empress but a wife.

All his courtship was filled with simple and touching feeling, in which there were no dynastic calculations or considerations of State. On 8 April, 1894 he wrote: "Wonderful, unforgettable day in my life; the day of my engagement to my darling, ador-

<sup>1</sup> Diaries of the Emperor Nicholas II.

able Alix; I even do not believe that I am engaged." And after that, each day brings him its stirring joys. On 15 April, "I went with Alix to the Queen (Victoria) . . . It is so strange to drive and walk with her, simply the two of us, without even worrying at all to think whether there is anything extraordinary in it. Later, I drove with my darling fiancée in the charabanc to Rosenau; we gathered flowers on the road and walked home; had tea, sat for another hour with my dear Alix; so quiet and nice with her." Typical are his notes after marriage. 14 November, 1894: "The day of my marriage." 15 November: "And so I am a married man. In the morning happily no one came to disturb us. At 5.0 the family invaded us with presents for my Alix and stayed to have tea with us." 21 November: "It is with pleasure that we are thinking of going to Tsarskoe for four days." 22 November: "I cannot say how nice it is to live on quietly seeing no one, all day and night together. We dined tête-à-tête in the corner room and went to bed early." 26 November: "My happiness is unbounded—it is very sad to leave Tsarskoe, which has become such a dear place for both of us. It is the first time since we were married that we have been alone and really lived soul to soul." Alexandra Fedorovna adds her note for the same day: "Ever more and more, stronger and deeper, my love and devotion grows and my longing for you." Nicholas and Alexandra did know domestic happiness, which is not often the lot of reigning personages. Apart from that, they both so strongly and definitely desired to have their own family with their own bounded personal daily life, their own "home," with their own personal belongings, that it was bound to express their own typical characteristics.

For their home they chose the Alexander Palace in Tsarskoe Selo, built as early as Catherine the Great for her favourite grandson Alexander I. It was built by the Italian architect Quarenghi in such a clean, classical style that it was free from the slightest sign of the old-fashioned. Charminglly placed in its own park with a magnificent transverse colonnade at the main entrance, with a south front that showed windows going down to the ground, this palace may be accounted one of the most harmonic models of the famous Russian "Empire" style. But its spacious, bright halls, which gave so much pleasure to Alexander I and Nicholas I by their shapeliness and evenness, were deserted by Nicholas II, but for ceremonial occasions and deputations.

For their private life they used one of the wings, which was

originally meant to accommodate their suite. The great concert hall which joined the wing to the main building was divided in such a way as to form two rooms, the study of Nicholas II and the maple drawing-room of Alexandra Fedorovna. The next rooms were situated on both sides of a corridor which divided the wing into two halves, the Tsar's half and the Tsarina's. This division did not harmonise with the general architecture; moreover, the new decoration of the rooms clashed badly with the basic style of the palace, but no one seems to have noticed that. The owners simply wanted to have the most comfortable, modern furniture, regardless of the question of style. The decoration was entrusted to the fashionable firm, Melzer, and the artistic side was completely ignored.

This disregard for art was not really usual in the Romanov family, which during the two centuries of its "Petersburg" rule manifested considerable taste in the creation of its surroundings. Artistic ignorance begins only with Alexander III and culminates with Nicholas II. His taste, as well as his wife's, was on the level of that of rich bourgeois who crammed their rooms with anything that was offered them by obliging purveyors; the only good articles in Nicholas II's suite were the oriental carpets. The furniture consisted of enormous writing-tables, colossal sofas, fashionable divans with high backs, shelves, soft arm-chairs and others with leather covers. The oil-painted walls were covered with discordant pictures; there were the sugary Greek women of Alma Tadema and even more sentimental heads by E. Böhm, executed in super-Russian style; O. Norie's "Royal Scots Greys" and "A Street in Old Moscow" by Samokish; "The Sea Before Sunset" by Krizhitsky and "Girl with a Crown of Vine" by Kaulbach. Cheap reproductions of any of these pictures could be found at any decent "artistic stationers" of that time; some of these pictures were indeed reproductions, put into frames of decadent style. Even the portraits of Alexandra Fedorovna and the Tsarevich were done by second-rate artists (Kaulbach, Gutty).

The rooms of Alexandra Fedorovna were furnished in a similar manner, except, of course, for their feminine character. The maple drawing-room, with roses in bas-relief, pink walls, pale pink furniture, grey-green carpet, was considered particularly smart. The rosewood or blue drawing-room and the lilac study were furnished in the same pale tones, crammed with shapeless furniture and cheap bric-à-brac and tasteless pictures.

But with time, life was instilled into the rooms and a personal

stamp appeared on the top of their cheap, fashionable character. To start with, every year, or even every month, some new photographs would appear. They filled enormous albums—the best of them were framed and placed on shelves, tables, étagères, dressing-tables, night-tables, etc.; there was no place without a photo of some member of the family; some were hung on the walls, even in the lavatory. Nicholas II and Alexandra Fedorovna seemed to have a morbid urge to fix every movement of theirs, every new dress, every change of season, to see themselves always surrounded by members of their family, most of all, their children. This might have been done subconsciously as a matter of habit, but the trait is characteristic. The cult of the family and its intimate entourage developed to the highest degree, excluding all interest in anyone else. Alexandra Fedorovna had neither friends nor a circle of devoted courtiers; she lacked that affability which was *de rigueur* in a Russian Empress; she took no part in the life of her entourage.

One of the important aspects of her love for her husband was the thought that he was a Tsar, God's anointed; apart from that love, the object of her greater preoccupation was the heir. At first she waited calmly for him; she was delighted at the birth of her first child, although it was a girl, Olga. Nicholas II was a tender father; wherever he was, he would try to be back at home so as not to miss his daughter's bath, and he would eagerly follow all the details of her development. But then came Tatyana, Maria, Anastasia; those were difficult months. Alexandra Fedorovna would suffer from dilation of the heart, from bad headaches; she would spend whole days lying on the sofa in her bedroom, her lilac study or the blue drawing-room, and all the time her thoughts were concentrated on one point, on the Tsarevich; he would make her victorious over the other members of the Imperial family who might inherit the throne and whom for that reason she hated. And every time this hope would be frustrated, and the expectation would begin anew. Through those tense months, filled with inner loneliness, she sought for support in images corresponding to her mental state. Her rooms were filled with mystical pictures of which the main themes were the Annunciation and the Madonna and Child. In the blue drawing-room, for instance, there was the Annunciation by Granitsch, with the inscription: "Ave Maria Grazia Plena," in a greenish, decadent frame; "Madonna with Child" by Thumann; "Woman Carrying a Baby" by Tofana. In

the lilac study were "The Annunciation" by Nesterov, "Le Sommeil de la Vierge" by Paupion, "The Annunciation" by Hoeker, "Madonna with Child" by an unknown artist; also "The Mystic Lily" by Dillon, "Angel Amongst Lilies" by Dubufe, "Lilies and Saint" by Schneider; in her bedroom, "Mother of God" by Vasnetsov, "Madonna" by Botticelli (copied by Rouillon), "Madonna" by an unknown Italian artist. Pictures and reproductions on similar subjects were plentiful in her rooms at the seaside palace in Peterhof. With the exception of Nesterov and Vasnetsov, two excellent artists, both exultant mystics, the rest of the painters were people of no renown who worked for the trade, specialising in marketable subjects. The sight of these Madonnas with hysterically widened eyes, Virgins transfigured by theatrical ecstasy, and artificial-looking lilies must produce in any spectator an impression of something morbid and abnormal; yet they must have harmonised with the hysterical moods of Alexandra Fedorovna.

But it was the icons that gave the strongest sense of solace and security. This woman, who had hesitated to marry the heir to the Russian throne, finding it difficult to give up the Lutheran confession, took over from the Orthodox church only its ritual elements bordering on fetishism. This served her as a moral support before the birth of Alexis; after his birth in the years of military disasters and unrest she sought in it protection against the approaching catastrophe. For her, icons were not only holy symbols, but also material objects which had a magic power; they could preserve the power of blessing, they could protect against evil and darkness. She collected icons of all saints indiscriminately, she received gifts from many monasteries, church communities, priests and pilgrims. One of her favourite occupations was to sort out the icons and hang them up; those she selected were hung up on the wall over her bed. At Tsarskoe Selo there must have been more than 200 icons in her bedroom, in the Peterhof palace about 150. Besides, in the bedroom of the Tsarskoe Selo palace there was a little chapel in the corridor behind the beds which was full of icons, triptychs, crosses, etc. Neither the age nor the artistic value of the icon had any meaning for her. Occasionally, but very seldom, there were articles of value amongst them, such as, for instance, a triptych of Stroganov's School, 17th century. The icons she treasured most were those "blessed" by Gregory Rasputin; of these she had two in the bedroom at Tsarskoe Selo; one, an icon



of the Mother of God with an unintelligible inscription, was meant to guard her during her sleep and on her journeys; the other, portraying Nicholas II, herself and Alexis receiving Christ's blessing (definitely a heretical subject, as only saints may figure in Orthodox icons), bears the inscription: "The Lord Himself saves them." On the icon in the bedroom at Peterhof was written: "Grigorey"—with a mistake in spelling!

Apart from these innumerable icons, Alexandra Fedorovna attributed great importance to prayer belts—ribbons with embroidered words of prayers, which she was given by Rasputin; she always kept them on her night table, and she would put them on for the night; during the War she would give them to officers and men. From her letters it is known that Philippe, whom she used to call "our first friend," gave her an icon with a little bell which was meant to warn her at the approach of "wicked people." In general she was apt to attribute a magic meaning to various articles connected with the other "friend," Rasputin. Thus on 14 June, 1915, she writes to her husband<sup>2</sup>: "I am sending you His stick (a fish holding a bird) which was sent to me from New Athos to be passed on to you. He has been using it, and is now sending it to you as a blessing; carry it sometimes if you can; I should like to think that it will be in your compartment next to the stick which was touched by Mr. Philippe." She also gave her husband Rasputin's comb, which the Tsar was to use before the meetings of the Council of Ministers and before Councils of War at the Front, so as to preserve his power and will, and to make him feel Gregory's blessing. Through her Rasputin once sent to the Tsar a bottle of wine, a lily of the valley and the crust of a loaf which he had eaten; Alexandra Fedorovna implored her husband to drink some of that wine, even if he did not like it. Nicholas II greatly comforted her by saying, "I drank the lot of it to the dregs." (January, 1916.) In the heir's nursery stood Gregory's crutch; there must have been many more similar "blessings" in the possession of the unfortunate Imperial family.

That Imperial home which had begun so happily, which was built for a quiet private life—too personal, perhaps, too secluded for the Head of a State—as time passed, became more and more tragically gloomy, so permeated by a poisoned atmosphere. The fanatical exaltation of Alexandra Fedorovna and the hysterical force which enabled her to rule over her husband turned this

<sup>2</sup> Letters of Nicholas II and Alexandra Fedorovna, Vol. 3.

couple into a kind of magnet attracting all those direct and evil forces which were fermenting in the divided, tortured and ruined Russia of the time. The word "Imperial" came to be suggestive of a fatal evil hanging over the country; the most ordinary things that happened in their family acquired a sinister significance. So, for instance, the gallery which was built between the Tsar's study and the Tsarina's drawing-room in order to enable them to communicate with each other without using any of the corridors was supposed to enable the Tsaritsa to listen from behind the hangings to any conference and receptions that might take place in the Emperor's study. It is possible that she did so, but, seeing the power she had over her husband, he was anyhow unable to avoid her influence.

One detail which seemed devoid of significance before the catastrophe acquired a particularly tragic meaning. The President of the French Republic, Loubet, when on his visit to Russia, presented Alexandra Fedorovna with a Gobelin, a more or less traditional present. The Gobelin reproduced the portrait by Vigée Lebrun, depicting Marie Antoinette amidst her children. The French Queen, young and beautiful, with the heir and the daughters, seemed to be an incarnation of that family happiness of which Alexandra Fedorovna had dreamed. It was assumed in the palace that she herself had chosen the subject of the Gobelin. Direct indications to that effect are missing; also the Gobelin was put up, not in the private suite, but left in the "corner room" at the entrance to it. After the Tsaritsa had shared the terrible fate of the French Queen, the Gobelin appeared in the light of a fatal warning. As a matter of fact, this is probably a mere coincidence which shows, by the way, how badly people remember the lessons of history.

The Alexander Palace at Tsarskoe Selo witnessed the last days of the monarchy; the Tsar returned to it after his abdication; as he was entering the front door by which revolutionary soldiers were now standing instead of the old guard, he, obeying the habit of many years, saluted them; his salute was not returned.

At the same palace, in the blue drawing-room, General Kornilov was to announce to the Tsaritsa that she was under arrest. "I am glad, General," she said, "that I hear that from you. I understand how difficult it was for you to tell me this."

From the same palace on August 1/14, 1917, Nicholas II went out with his family to go to exile and death.

T. CHERNAVIN.

## GUNDULIĆ, THE POET OF THE RAGUSAN REPUBLIC<sup>1</sup>

THE chief personality of the Golden Age of Ragusan literature is Gjivo Franjin Gundulić (1588/9—1638), its greatest representative in all three poetic spheres, of epic, lyric and drama. In this poet, the Republic of Dubrovnik achieved, at the turn of the century, the height of its material welfare and spiritual culture, and found supreme literary expression. As the result of a wisely-conducted foreign and overseas trade there was much wealth both among the nobles and all ranks of the population. Indeed, they lived in comfort and luxury; but with the rise in the general standard of life there was a corresponding spread of culture among the leading personalities. While the first early classical period of humanism, in the 15th century, had spread a knowledge of Latin among those citizens who could read and write, and had thus brought them closer to classical and humanistic writings, this second period of nationalised humanism, in the 16th century, was more in touch with Italian literature at the moment of its richest blossom. Henceforth the Ragusans closely followed all its chief products and derived the most direct profit from it. The materialisation of cultural values had, it is true, also introduced among them certain coarse social defects. The demoralisation in the higher ranks had provoked against it the gay humour of Držić and the biting epigrams of Ranjinin, but beyond this the literary reaction did not go. The Reformation awakened but little echo at Dubrovnik, owing to the practical opportunism of official policy, but there was just as little trace there of the Counter-Reformation, either in the Church or in society. Closely linked with Catholicism, the Republic had rather been passive towards the influence of either, so long as they did not endanger its security and political liberty. Two events in particular illustrate this attitude of cautious trimming. In order to free itself from the Papal ban imposed in 1602 on account of the murder of two priests during the repression of the Lastovo (Lagosta) rebellion, the Republic allowed the introduction of the Jesuit Order in 1604. On the other hand, it soon after executed two of its nobles, who were leaders of a secret movement for the liberation of the

<sup>1</sup> This article is a translation of "The Golden Age of Literature in the 17th Century," from Professor Vinko Lozovina's admirable book *Dalmacija u novatskoj Književnosti* ("Dalmatia in Croat Literature"), published in Zagreb in 1936 by the "Matica Hrvatska."

Christian countries from the Turkish yoke—and this to prevent its coming to war with the Porte on their account. In both cases the Republic acted from purely political motives. In leaving to the Jesuits unrestricted influence upon the educational and spiritual life of the people, it also opened the door to the new spirit of reaction against anti-Christian humanism and against the anti-Catholic Reformation which that humanism had called forth. This spirit speedily cast its shadow upon Ragusan literature, with special effect on its artistic side.

Gundulić is, both as literary figure and as representative of the ruling caste, the first expression of this new spirit. His father Franjo was five times "Knez" of the Republic: through his mother he belonged to the noble family of Gradić. It is thus quite natural that Gjivo obtained prominent posts in the State service: he was a member of the Court of Appeal, judge in penal cases, senator and member of the Lesser Council. He married somewhat late in life and had three sons. The eldest, Franjo, distinguished himself in the wars against the Turks, married a lady of the Viennese Court, of the family of Strozzi, and reached the rank of Marshal in the Imperial service.

The poet's literary development is known to have been influenced by his two teachers, Camillo Camilli, a Tuscan from Siena, who was Rector of the Dubrovnik Schools, and had a remarkable knowledge of Tasso's poetry, and Peter Palikuća, of Lopud, a learned Jesuit, who wrote Croat prose and Latin verse. This education on the counter-revolutionary lines of the Order of Jesus explains many points in Gundulić's riper literary work, and in particular the sudden change towards the close of his more youthful period. This had been entirely filled by erotic lyrical and dramatic productions, in the style of the classical-mythological and pastoral drama, which was often of a prurient character. He had turned out ten dramatic adaptations of the best-known subjects in contemporary Italian drama, and these were performed at Dubrovnik "with great success," according to the poet's own assertion. Their mere titles—Galatea, Diana, Armida, The Rape of Proserpine, Ariadne, Cleopatra, Adonis—sufficiently characterise his theatre repertoire. They also show why Gundulić at a riper age rejected them, and was unwilling to remain the singer of "poetic conceits," and why, by the side of the classic mythologies of Ariadne and Proserpine, the fragments of such romantic tragi-comedies as Armida and Diana have not been

preserved. Only one of them, *Ariadne*, was printed (in 1633). It is a translation of the melodrama of the same name by Ottavio Rinuccini, first produced at Florence in 1608, with music by Giacomo Peri and Claudio Monteverde, the most famous composer of that time. *Proserpine* was extracted from the Latin epic of Claudian, the poet of Latin in its last stage of decline.

Of his youthful love poetry only that entitled "The Shy Lover" (Ljubovnik Sramežljiv) has been preserved, and this too is a translation based on three Italian poems of Girolamo Preti, developing the theme of Ovid's letter of "Hippolytus to Phædrus." There was a fair amount of this poetry, now unknown to us, to judge by an Epistle of Oracije Mežibradić to Pluvković, in which the following verses are to be found:

Noble love-songs have I known  
That your noble pen indited;  
Ne'er hath Nightingale delighted  
Bosky grove with sweeter groan.

Those sweet songs of yours, I swear,  
When to public gaze you grant them,  
Shepherds everywhere will chant them,  
Lords and ladies everywhere. . . .

In 1620 there opens a new period of Gundulić's work, with paraphrases of the *Penitential Psalms of King David*. In dedicating them to Maro Bunić, the poet describes his whole work hitherto—"all born of me"—as unworthy to see the light. Then follow his most finished and valuable poetical productions—lyrics of a spiritual and penitential kind, and a half-lyrical, half-epic poem entitled *Tears of a Prodigal Son*, printed at Venice in 1622, and modelled on *The Tears of St. Peter* of the Italian poet Tansillo. It is divided into three "laments" or cantos, depicting three phases of the repenting soul—sin, comprehension, contrition—on well-known biblical lines and in sincere and lively accents of autobiographical fact. The luxuriance of the poet's language, full of similes, tropes and figures, the technical perfection of his sestines (in which the thought, developed in the first four lines, is compressed epigrammatically in the last two), then the elegance and spontaneity of his diction, all these distinctions of form and vivacity of content, combine into a harmonious whole. This specimen of religious lyrical poetry leaves far behind its Italian model and avoids the

ponderous exaggerations of "Seicento" style, the so-called "Marinism," only the most perfect examples of which appealed to Gundulić, owing to their revolutionary novelty.

Of his purely lyrical poems his hymn "On the Majesty of God" is an echo of the earlier psalms in paraphrase. One event explains the ripe and serious character of his new style, "Poem to Ferdinand II, Duke of Tuscany," celebrating that ruler's marriage in 1631; in it he introduces political allusions to liberation from the Turks and exalts the heroic and fortunate rôle which he is destined to play in future wars. In these allusions is concealed the first germ of those lofty ideas which are to inspire his *Osman*, the rôle of liberator being transferred from Ferdinand of Tuscany to King Vladislav of Poland.

In 1628, in his fortieth year, Gundulić wrote *Dubravka*, a pastoral drama in three acts, his most finished achievement. It is the best thing of its kind ever produced in Ragusan literature, and it is not easy to find its equal in Italian or any other European literature. It was performed in that year on the day of St. Blaise, the patron of the Republic, and on the occasion of the author's marriage. In conception and contents it is a glorification of Ragusan liberty and at the same time a noble expression of Gundulić's patriotism. Its theme is placed in a distant pagan age of mythical early Slav personalities, such as Hoja, Lera and Dolerije. The shepherds celebrate the anniversary of Ragusan freedom with song and dance, as had been the immemorial custom in Dubrovnik. On this day the most beautiful girl married the handsomest youth, according to the award of the shepherd's court. This time, by general consent, the choice should have fallen upon Dubravka and Miljenko: but the shepherd Grdan, whose very name reveals his character, bribes the judges and Dubravka is awarded to Grdan, to the great sorrow and horror of the shepherd world. The priest is on the point of marrying them in the temple of Lera, the God of Love, when suddenly there is a great earthquake, the offering will not burn, the temple re-echoes with the thunder, and even the statue of Lera is deluged in sweat. While all is fear and panic, Miljenko enters the temple, and the portents at once cease—the offering bursts into flame and Lera's face is once more serene. With this divine hint there comes a change, the priest marries the predestined happy pair and the choir of shepherds sings the inspiring hymn to golden Liberty (*O lijepa, o draga, o zlatna Slobobo*).

The allegorical features, so characteristic of the classical

Italian idyll and pastoral drama, and transplanted by Gundulić to Slav soil, are perfectly clear in this drama. Dubravka is the free Republic of Dubrovnik: she must be ruled by the best and worthiest of her sons; the greatest danger threatens from her enemy Grdan and his golden calf. The old fisherman who appears at the beginning of the play as a refugee from somewhere along the coast, from Turkish or Venetian rule, where force and illegality prevail, seeking refuge in "the sweet rest of precious liberty," is the symbol of the efforts of our people for liberation from foreign yoke. In one scene after the other, now in jest, now in earnest, he turns his fire upon social defects, corruption, avarice, extravagance, luxury and matrimonial infidelity, but all with tact and caution, transplanting everything into the mythical times of early Slavdom. In this way a pastoral play of erotic fancy and shepherd idylls, with its piquancy and love adventures, is purified from its flaws by the poetic genius of Gundulić and the earnestness of his patriotic aims: its finished literary form imparts to it reality, at once serious and exalted, and quite transparent, despite its allegorical form.

The *Psalms of King David*, in the Rome edition of 1620, contain, among other things, the very enlightening announcement that, instead of secular poetry, to which the author has hitherto devoted himself and which he now condemns, he will henceforward confine himself to religious poetry. First of all he will translate Tasso's *Jerusalem Liberated*, with the purpose of showing "to our whole Slav nation," adorned by "the honoured name of the exalted King of Poland," Sigismund.III (1587-1632). This praise gives expression to some such thought as this: that just as Tasso's epic, celebrating the liberation of the Holy Sepulchre in the first crusading war waged by the Latin nations, was by the heroism of God's warriors to rouse the Christian West to a fresh war of liberation against the Turks (in which the new Godfrey would be Tasso's Mæcenas, Alfonso d'Este), so Gundulić's translation of it was to kindle the Slavs, especially those of the South, to war against these same Turks, and, as final aim, to set free the desolated Balkans, and with them Central Europe, which was already threatened. This war would be led by Sigismund of Poland, as the strongest State of Slav language.

Meanwhile momentous events had been taking place in the neighbouring eastern countries—the splendid Polish victory over

the Turks at Hotin in 1621, its catastrophic consequences for the Ottoman Empire, the conspiracy of the Turkish Army in Constantinople against the Sultan's political designs, the dethronement of Osman II, the rehabilitation of his uncle Mustafa, who had some years earlier been overthrown and imprisoned, and Osman's sudden death in prison. All these events diverted the poet from the translation of foreign works, and provided him with the basis for a similar, but original, epic, in which the victorious advance of the Polish Army and the fatal internal chaos in the lands of the Crescent would be celebrated as the prologue to the speedy liberation of the Southern Slavs and the other subject Christian peoples.

This was the origin of our first great heroic epic poem, *Osman*, in twenty cantos. The first section (Cantos I and XVI-XX) describes the preparations of Osman to move eastwards after the unfortunate war with Poland, how they equipped their armies anew and, after purging them of the old revolutionary elements, launched them upon a new war against the Christians. This new plan of Osman, however, does not succeed, but on the contrary ends with his dethronement and violent death. In the second interpolated section (Cantos II-XIII) and in connection with the Sultan's fatal plans, there is a description of two previous embassies from the Sultan—the diplomatic mission of Ali Pasha to Warsaw to offer the Poles a separate peace, and the official journey of Kizlar Aga, who is travelling through the Empire to select and bring to Constantinople the most famous and reputable beauties, so that the Sultan may choose a wife from among them. Accordingly these are the main threads of the poem—Osman's preparations for his journey to Asia for secret military objects, his previous marriage and the conclusion of peace with the Poles for a fresh and even fiercer attack upon them, the conspiracy in the army and the Sultan's sudden death. Round the person of the Sultan are intricately woven every sort of good and evil happening, following the real sequence of historical events. Round the journeys of Ali Pasha and Kizlar Aga the poet's fantasy has devised all sorts of episodes on the same lines as Tasso's heroic epopee. Their aim is that historic truth, the gloomy and bitter reality, should find in the poet's agreeable fantasia their spice and adornment. Ali's passage across the battlefield of Hotin awakens in its full force the memory of the recent Turkish defeat and Polish victory, the number of the Turkish troops, the confusion into which they



were thrown—their further memories of the heroine Sokolica on the Turkish side and of Kronoslava, who, even after the capture of her husband Korewski, fought in the Polish Army as Sokolica's rival, and then went in disguise to Constantinople to rescue her husband from prison. The arrival of the Pasha in Warsaw and his stay at the Town Hall before the conclusion of peace gives him an opportunity of seeing the greatness of the Polish Army, the progress of the struggle at Hotin, the heroism of Vladislav and so on. In the same way the journey of Kizlar Aga in search of beauties is bound up with all kinds of romantic adventures. The best of them is the episode of old Ljubdrag, a grandson of the Serbian despot George Branković, whom the Turks had already deprived of all his possessions, and of his daughter, Sunčanica, whom the Aga now ruthlessly takes away from him: then the episode of Sokolica, whom the Aga carries off with other beauties to Constantinople. Besides these purely romantic incidents there is the affair of the devils under their leader Beelzebub, who gather together all the powers of evil, to prevent the impending peace with Poland and thus help the Turkish cause (Canto XIII).

In describing the battle of Hotin and the jubilation of the Poles Gundulić does special honour to Prince Vladislav's heroism in the struggle of Cross against Crescent, and to him is assigned the rôle of the new Godfrey of Bouillon, who is to free the Southern Slavs from the Turkish yoke. Vladislav, who had taken part in the battle of Hotin as the King's deputy, took a journey somewhat later through Christian lands to Loreto, partly as a pilgrim to the shrine, but partly on a political mission, and on his return passed through Ancona, where the Gundulić family had long had a house. It is important that on this occasion the Prince was their guest, and that the poet made his personal acquaintance. The idea of his epic certainly took shape at that period (1623-4) after the battle of Hotin and the downfall of Osman.

Gundulić worked at *Osman* till his death in 1638, but did not leave it entirely finished: two cantos, the fourteenth and fifteenth, are missing, the very ones in which the two main episodes were to be completed—the bringing of Sokolica and Sunčanica to the Sultan in Constantinople, the fate of Kronoslava and Korewski in prison, and Ali Pasha's return with information about the conclusion of peace. These gaps have given rise to all sorts of doubts and speculations among the students of

Gundulić as to whether the two cantos were ever actually written, and were destroyed for this or that reason, and three later poets have tried to replace them—two Ragusans, Maro Dinkov Zlatarić and Pjerko Sorkočević, and a Croat from Vinodol, Ivan Mažuranić, who, as a great poet, but closely imitating his forerunner's literary style, has outdistanced not only the two Ragusans, but their original model.

In *Osman* Gundulić follows the example of the great epic poet Tasso in his *Jerusalem Liberated*. From the formal stylistic side he was influenced by the literary baroque of the "Seicento," which first became fully apparent in Tasso, and reached its highest point of development in the works of Gundulić's contemporary Giambattista Marini (1569-1625), from whom this tendency has acquired the name of Marinism. Our poet is no mere slavish imitator, either in technique or in diction: he has copied Tasso in the same sense as Virgil in the *Æneid* copied Homer. While Gundulić follows in some respects poetical fashions, yet his sound sense and balanced judgment saved him from falling into baroque extremes. *Osman* has many analogies with *Jerusalem Liberated* in its origin, its diction, its technique, its tendencies, but it also has characteristic divergences. After the Christian naval victory of Lepanto in 1571, Tasso celebrates the heroism of the first Christian armies, in order to rouse his contemporaries, the Latin nations and the rest of Christendom, in defence against Turkish invasion. Gundulić writes his epic immediately after Hotin, and sharing the general view of Christendom that this victory and the murder of Osman were the work of Divine Providence, and a sure portent of the downfall of the Ottoman Empire and the speedy triumph of the Cross over the Crescent. Gundulić, like Tasso, is truly a "Christian poet," but his enthusiasm is more direct, his poetical work has a more immediate note, because it is based upon close contemporary events. He is a witness and a sentinel, in all the sufferings and troubles which his co-nationals and the other Balkan nations have endured under the Turkish yoke. He is the inspired poet of Ragusan patriotism, who above all trembles for the liberty which his native city has so narrowly preserved. From this angle he is the national poet and prophet: the Sword which shall set free the unhappy Rayah from the Eastern dragon comes from the North, and it is a fraternal Slavonic Sword. Together with the general Christian and religious idea *Osman* also contains the All-Slav political idea, in its essence Polonophil.

This friendship for Poland, at the height of the Polish State in the 17th century, precedes the Russophilism of the 18th and 19th, when the Balkan Slavs, still remaining in slavery after the failure of these poetic dreams of Turkish downfall, turned their eyes to Russia as the greatest Slav State. Accordingly, in Gundulić's great epic not everything is foreign and this is also true of his *Dubravka*, which is an excellent example of the transplanting of originally foreign art to a native soil and national *milieu*. In *Osman* there are frequent echoes from the national *gusla*, genuine notes from our most ancient national epics (the so-called *bugarštice*). Thus, while working on a foreign model, Gundulić shows alike in conception, in construction and in form, no little originality, and hence he is a great poet—a follower of Tasso, but also his rival in genius, more national and more of a Slav than Tasso is Latin and an Italian nationalist. *Osman* is in its poetical form and in its leading ideas the greatest work of the old Ragusan literature. He is the sunlit peak, beside which will still appear some independent and good poets, but then will follow foreign invasion and the speedy downfall of the Republic.

(Tr. R.W. S.-W.)

VINKO LOZOVINA.

## ROZTWOROWSKI—POLISH TRAGIC DRAMATIST : 1877—1938

ON 4 February, 1938, there died in Cracow Karol Hubert Roztworowski, the author of *Judas*, *Caligula* and *Surprise*, three masterpieces of modern Polish drama. Thanks to them, the judgment has long since prevailed that no second writer in the country has possessed the sense of tragedy as he did. When we reflect on the creative power of his spirit, on the profoundness of his moral inquisitiveness, on the distinctiveness of his dramatic expression, and on the grandeur of his realism, we must concede him the title of creator of the newer Christian tragedy.

Roztworowski was a Christian in the fullest sense of that term—both as a writer and as a man. For him the Faith was something felt within, something consciously apprehended as a personal and social necessity. When, after a long illness, born with endless patience, a violent hæmorrhage came upon him on that long winter night, announcing that the end was near, his wife asked him one question: "Do you believe?", and the answer of the dying man was "I do!" His close friend, Father Konstanty Michalski, Rector of the University of Cracow, spoke at the funeral, and in the course of a moving address called the deceased "a herald of God." There were those who, in writing about Roztworowski's work in those days, ventured to recall Athenian tragedy; seeing that "in the sensing of tragic elements, in his skill in expressing them, he had something of the power of the great Greeks." "He felt the relation of God to man with the same liveliness and depth as did Sophocles, who held that the hand of the gods was at work in human affairs."

Nevertheless, it would be a grave error to think of him as an ascetic, who buried himself in the contemplation of the Unseen. Both as a citizen and as a poet, he was a man of this world. For a number of years his illness kept him from leaving his home, but he took an active interest in everything around him, whether social or literary. He was a Member of the Academy of Letters, he was president of the Cracow Branch of the Association of Polish Writers, and he was a City Councillor. To the end of his life he took part in public affairs, meetings frequently being held in his home; or, if this was not possible, his views were consulted. These he never thrust on anyone, but they often played the decisive rôle in difficult issues.

He was particularly concerned for the work of the younger generation in literature; and he welcomed new talent with enthusiasm, gladly lending both counsel and moral support. His door was always open to visitors; he would say that they brought him living news from the great world; but the truth was that he more than repaid them with the life and energy that everyone felt to be emanating from his almost inspired personality. Not only his position among writers, but also his personal appearance commanded respect. His figure was tall; his countenance of noble cast—it recalled that of a Roman patrician. Whoever approached him, a thing his inborn courtesy made easy, quickly succumbed to the atmosphere of simple frankness that surrounded him. On the other hand, when anything did not meet with his approval, he would speak his mind quite plainly. He honoured with his friendship, not only people of distinction, but also the young and even the tiny. His completed works show clearly that while Roztworowski was an outstanding intellectual, he was far from any abstraction of spirit. Body and soul, he was alive in the world; his mind went deeply into metaphysical problems, but it was rooted firmly in the soil of daily living. Hence his religious fervour, to which we have already referred. Yet this realisation of union with God did not come as a gift handed to him on a platter. He had to win his way to it for himself. His gifts of thinking and writing were only acquired in the school of conscious effort.

## I

Roztworowski was born on 3 November, 1877, in the country near Cracow, the son of a gentleman farmer. His early years were spent amid the villagers, and did much to develop in him a realistic sense of life—especially that coming from a closer contact with the forces of Nature. Even his language betrays in places this intimacy with the life of the peasants. He would take a philosophical abstraction, put it into pregnant sentences, and then discover that the shape and form of the concept he was nurturing recalled the picturesque proverbs of the village wise-acres. With this difference, of course, that beneath the bluntness of expression lurked ideas that had ripened to scientific detachment. What is more, the Christian ethic of Roztworowski has its foundations in the soil of human suffering. Of this the sharpest outlines are to be found in man's wrestlings down the

ages with the might of Nature. All this serves as a stepping-stone to a union with God, and to faith in a divine Providence.

He was a pupil in St. Anne's gymnasium in Cracow, that famous Polish school founded by the Knight of Malta, Bartholomew Nowodworski, three hundred and fifty years ago. It is notable that neither the historical associations of that institution, nor those of the ancient capital of Poland, where he was later to make his home, seem to have made any deep impression on the developing mind of the youth. His interests ran rather in the direction of the universal. Early literary efforts had little in common with the prevailing atmosphere of the city, which in those days was the chief centre of modernist and neo-romantic tendencies. The truth is that the young Roztworowski, expecting to succeed his father as a farmer, trained himself for agriculture—first in Czernichow, near Cracow, and then in Halle. Even so, he would dream of music, and he was already writing verses; and the result was that he transferred to the neighbouring Leipzig for some years of devotion to music and philosophy. He ended up with a period of study in Berlin, and travels in Italy and in France served to complete his preparation.

He was no mean musician, even his compositions finding recognition among competent critics. A great future was prophesied for him in that field. "But," he wrote in a fragment of autobiography:

"these musical prognostications had no such meaning for me. They were the notions of professors who were deceived by the smartness of their pupil. The more they praised me, the more I laughed in my sleeve, for I knew that I hadn't a trace of musical inventiveness in me. Why then did they praise me? Simply because I created a "theory." Yes, I started a new tendency in music! I would modulate in my mind, and would put on paper simply the fruitage of this modulating. In other words, I would put together the most curious freaks, in which no person could find his way without a commentary. Since, however, even freakishness, when logically constituted, must leave the impression of a logical wholeness (even though it does not make sense), people would nod their heads at me, until I myself uncovered my cards. I told my astonished teachers that everything I had done was not art but only artifice! Then I turned to literature—this time, it is true, without any artifice."

This personal confession of the poet is of high significance for defining the creative qualities he displayed. External perfection was not enough for him, he wanted always to get at the inner soul of things. His faculties of self-criticism came from a consciousness of spiritual riches, and from a lively temperament. In respect of his musical abilities, he was rather too stern a judge; for musical criticism has conceded his youthful works a search for independence of style and a conscious aiming after higher planes. However, he gave his life to other forms of expression, though he never neglected his music. He would play the piano devotedly. "Not as a professional," says one who knew, "but as an amateur full of feeling for what he was doing." And it was one of the sharpest blows to his happiness that, for years before his end, the doctors forbade him to play, owing to the weak state of his health.

His musical studies and these essays in composition were only a schooling for the future dramatist. Already in the early stages of his writing Roztworowski would say that every dramatist should be a composer and a philosopher. He himself was both, and even if this observation cannot be made into a general rule for all, at least in his own case it tells the whole truth. In all his works the acoustic factor is of first-class significance: along with the philosophical idea, the vigour of the action and an unequalled visualisation of the parts. To the plays of Roztworowski one could well refer the words of the youthful Nietzsche about tragedies being born from the spirit of music. When we are trying to analyse the dramatic technique of the man, we come upon a fundamental problem. Even the directions given by the author as to the scenery of his plays would often be explained by musical signs; and the instrumentation of the various voices of the speaking chorus in the collective scenes recalls an orchestral score. More than that. Even the form of expression and of the dialogue in his dramas—something that was always lively and full of suggestiveness—was musical in character. His very words are a harmony. As one commentator has put it:

"Roztworowski goes into action with the whole scale of living nuances: with *pianissimo* for groups and *fortissimo* for solos. It is as though he were setting his play to music, and only on rare occasions does he admit cacophony or discords. But another factor is also there, making for music, too—the rhythm of his verses. To the

poet this was even more vital than their melody; and rhythm takes the foremost place, even ahead of the form and content of his words. The people in his drama become something like rhythmic *motifs*, each one setting forth his sentiments by the cadence of his speech."

To these words of a specialist, one might add one further comment. Every person in Roztworowski's works possesses his own distinctive spiritual tone, and during the whole action this is brought out by special scenic effects. At the same time, the composition of the plays is always logical, depending on a carefully worked-out plan; and the delineations of the various characters have the earmarks of a realistic expression of truth.

## II

The poet had behind him already two theatrical successes when there was suddenly revealed in him still another gift—that of a public speaker of distinction. It was called into being by the stress of patriotic feelings, on the town square of Cracow in February, 1918.<sup>1</sup> His elemental appeal stirred the throng on this occasion of a national demonstration. Again, during the war with Bolshevik Russia in 1920, the poet volunteered for military service. He was assigned to the section for propaganda, and sent to give addresses to the young troops in their barracks, or in hospital. From that time on, the living word became for the poet a regular instrument of expression. He was to appear publicly as the advocate of more than one good cause, social or national, whenever his interest was aroused. He would always speak with enthusiasm, *extempore*, and with an emotional modulation of voice that stirred even the indifferent listener to attention. The author of this paper had many opportunities of confirming this during a tour made together with other Cracow writers in Czechoslovakia in 1931. The speeches he made, though unprepared, made such an impression on Czech audiences that even those disposed to heckle him on their contents were reduced to silence. He spoke well in Polish, but equally well in French. After an address given in that tongue at an international gathering in Cracow, a visitor from abroad, a specialist in ancient oratory and rhetoric, said this:

"Not till I heard your Roztworowski did I realise to the full the message of the anonymous Greek author *On*

<sup>1</sup> These were the days of general indignation at the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk, notably at the part played by the Austrian Minister Czernim.



*the Sublime.* Where a speaker attains to the sublime, the soul of the listener is exalted . . . as if it had itself given expression to what it has heard. While listening to such an orator, one does not reflect on the words or the ideas, for they act on one like a thunder-bolt. Not many speakers with such sincerity of pathos are to be heard today. I rejoice to have had the opportunity of listening to such greatness of soul."

In the light of this witness, we can appreciate the true calling of the poet, which was to create the modern drama of ideas. Before this happened, nevertheless, one further important crisis was to intervene in the soul of the man. His longer sojourn abroad for study (1898-1908), the influence of foreign surroundings in the abstract world of music and philosophy, finally the spiritual unrest of his youth, had almost erased his sentiments of religion and patriotism. The war, and the struggle for national independence that went with it, set on fire in him an ardent love of country. Almost at the same time came a religious event—his conversion. It came as a sort of explosion—an elemental rousing of the spirit. A hunger after the absolute seized Roztworowski, and rooted him in a new union with God. But his first thoughts were of service for his fellows, and the purpose took shape of entering the special Polish branch of the Franciscan Order, known as the Albertines, whose chief care from the start had been homeless beggars and street children. But the Founder, Brother Albert, known in earlier life as Adam Chmielowski, though he had himself left his painting to become a Friar, brought Roztworowski to change his purpose. It was as though he foresaw that the flame of faith which had been lighted in his soul would bring more blessing to men if it spent itself in poetry. And so it has turned out. "There is no shadow of doubt," says one critic, "that the essence of creative genius was released in the man by his new-found faith." Before *Judas* Roztworowski was an author who aroused interest, but his work was chaotic. Faith introduced order into his thinking, gave his powers an axis around which to turn, and provided his inspiration with wings.

"Literature," we read in the fragment of autobiography mentioned above, "used to tempt me in slow and in silent ways; but so surely that the case was hopeless. I sold myself to it, body and soul. Yes, this it was which from childhood, and unconsciously, I was in search of; to it I was unconsciously

tending by devious ways. When I stood at last on the stage floor, I knew that now it was a matter of 'to be or not to be.' "

### III

The first published edition of Roztworowski's poems comes from as far back as 1901. His dramas were first put on the boards in 1910. Neither the early verses nor the dramas aroused any lively interest. The author himself, for that matter, has made light of these first efforts, and with his usual critical temper did not include them in the edition of his collected works. All the same, even though the plays failed on the stage, the author received encouragement at the hands of the eminent actor and producer, Ludwik Solski, who at once recognised unusual talent and the promise of better things in the future. Their first theatrical triumph together was the performance in 1913 on the Cracow stage of the biblical drama *Judas Iscariot* in five acts. Four years later, in the Polish Theatre in Warsaw, Roztworowski's second masterpiece appeared, the four-act play from Roman imperial days—*Caius Cæsar Caligula*.

"The magnetic power and popularity of the theatre," wrote the author in 1919, "probably lies in the fact that the seeing of works on the stage is nothing else than a looking into oneself."

By way of developing this view one might add that the basis of tragedy is always an ethical problem. The issue of conscience, and the part played in daily life by duty—there you have the warp and woof of the tragedian's attack on life. Man is fighting with himself *for* himself, which means for his goal in life. The matter is complicated, however, by the fact that man is never alone, but is always in close contact with the world about him. In one's relation to oneself the only problem would be a metaphysical one, and this is also at times a knot to be untied in the drama. It becomes the source of an inner sense of tragedy in the face of destiny or *Fatum*, but it does not evoke actual tragic situations on the stage. The field of tragedy for man is the actuality which continues: the desire to rule others or to survive oneself—in a word, the revolt against a reality to be faced. This it is which creates tragedy. The consciousness of the irrationality of being, though it calls forth tragic upheavals, does not lead to tragedy. This matter must have as subject a concretely-put ethical problem, proceeding from the will of some being: a will that has been reinforced emotionally and matured intellectually, and which finds itself wrestling with the inevitabilities of life. Tragedy not only reveals suffering, not only

awakens pity or even sympathy, but also—and here is its proper nature—it uncovers the heroic attitude in man. It leads him to liberation through *catharsis*. The distortion of tragedy, as if it were seen in a concave mirror, is tragedy-comedy. Between these two one finds the ideally conceived “psychological drama,” or the drama of ideas, which objectifies the most deeply subjective tragedy. Such creations are the two works under consideration—*Judas Iscariot* and *Caius Cæsar Caligula*.

About both these plays there is an atmosphere of tragedy that is carried to the highest degree; yet they are not properly tragedies. It will not be a misrepresentation to say that the author did not want them to be. Undertaking a psychological revision of accepted views about historical figures, he sought not to rehabilitate, but to explain, not to justify, but to humanise, them. “But, surely, I too am . . . a man!” cries out Judas to Caiaphas from the depths of his deprived soul. “He was only a man!” says Demetrius over the body of the dead emperor. But nothing more. Neither Judas nor Caligula, though outwardly so extremely tragical, though inwardly so powerfully portrayed, rises to the heroic heights of tragedy. Precisely here was their weakness. They did not possess the sense of individual responsibility, they were not equal to the tasks laid upon them. Judas was a mediocre man, an average representative of the crowd; he had not risen to apostleship. And since he had not attained the advantages to be expected therefrom in this life, he was threatened with persecution and out of cowardice betrayed his Master. Only once does he aspire even to insolence, when, in the presence of the Jewish Elders, he becomes conscious of the fact that he is necessary; but even then, under the rebuke of Caiaphas, he at once becomes humble. We have here one of those “terrible children” which Roztworowski was to give us in a grotesque tragedy-farce of that title in 1922. They are thoughtless dolls, governed only by their primitive needs, but who in the end are also admitted to salvation.

The betrayal of his Master by Judas has nothing of the demoniac in it. It was based solely on human calculations—on the mentality of a petty trader, which could not distinguish the things of heaven from those of earth. The “rehabilitation” of Judas in the drama consists in the understanding of the mystery of the human soul shown by the author, the understanding of a trespass that was not the fault of the trespasser. In order that “the law might be fulfilled” the betrayal was necessary, and for this end Judas was called on to become a disciple. Should

one on that account have denied him forgiveness? Certainly not. It is the great triumph of Roztworowski that he did not fall into the fashionable exaggeration of an extreme revisionism; but in a purely human way, and yet a Christian way, he succeeded in saving the soul of the man from condemnation. On the other hand, the distance that separated the creator of the drama from his creation had a remarkable effect. A work was produced whose psychological content, at the same time simple and complicated, exhausting, highly tense situations, and centred in a man who lived and shed blood, was nevertheless so completely objectified that Judas does not evoke sympathy in us. At best, we are moved to pity over the wretchedness of the human lot. And that is just what the author desired. Although in our heart of hearts we stand higher than Judas, though we were even washed whiter than snow, there will still be found a tiny share with the betrayal of our Master. Still more with the Judas, whose human features have been given us to know and to understand by Roztworowski.

On his way to a deeper sounding of human nature, the author, after his *Judas*, found himself faced by the enigma of Caligula; the degenerate neurasthenic who, by the fatalism of historic necessity, was the ruler of Rome. In the polemic that was let loose by the first appearance of this work, Roztworowski defended himself against various charges as follows:

"That Caligula has found sympathy in many hearts is not my fault. That the majority have felt pity for him is my pride. One should not display pity there, where the spirit is calm and the mind is the guardian of human dignity; but rather there, where the lack of a *dogma for living* floods the brain with the heart's blood, and the heart is made cold by the brain."

To the comment of one critic, that after the murder of Caligula there remained an ethical vacuum, the author went on: "This vacuum was introduced on the stage before the curtain rose," for "the *dramatis persona* is the Christian ethic." But this *dramatis persona* does not find its personification in *Caligula*. The drama of Judas is placed in an atmosphere that is always near the presence of Christ, though He does not appear on the scene. In *Caligula* we do not even feel such a presence. The whole atmosphere of the work is saturated with senselessness. It is barren of every hope, and does not permit of even the slightest spark that would suggest the light of salvation. All the same, it is just here that we feel the living man, who, trembling in every nerve, is the typical example of human misery—

this time on the heights of the social hierarchy. It is not known whether this was the conscious purpose of the author, that alongside a member of the proletariat, Judas, he wanted to show another prime example of human worthlessness, but at the other end of the social scale. We have the cases of Dziadowka and Bogacz in *Mercy* (1920), the author's mystery play, where the words of the Judge again fall—"Behold a man!" Here, too, there sounds the mighty echo of human tragedy, flowing from the author's pessimism in the face of the fragile and sinful nature of man. It did, however, find healing in the final accord of religious consolation. In *Caligula* the choice of high social status for the hero of a drama dealing with the extremes of pathological condition permitted Roztworowski to develop a broad measure of his mastery over the scenic portrayal of the human soul. By this deeper sounding of subtle analysis, effected with chemical exactness and with the infallibility of the laboratory, *Caligula* has taken on precisely these arch-human features which permit the verdict "Only a man!" The result is pity for the misery of a human being, even on the throne of the Cæsars.

The earlier dramas of Roztworowski were far from equalling his later ones, although they provoked interest by their daring in the putting of problems, and in many details suggested the master to come. Even then it was observed that the author portrayed his characters not so much by the words they spoke or those spoken about them as by the situations revealed between the minds of the actors. Once the main lines of characterisation had been created and the tissue of human relationships in a given time and place determined on, it was rather indifferent how the course of events might turn. Without regard to the question whether the cup of destiny would be filled up or not, nothing now could change things. In all this we have the tragic sense of a drama being enacted outside ourselves, where one has no power to choose, but is subject to the *fatum* of actualities. So it was with *Caligula*. The fact that the conspirators did rise to the heights of murder matters little. Nothing was changed by this event, nothing kept still. The moral vacuum was not done away. In his defence of the play Roztworowski tells us that it had to be so, since historical exactness did not permit of the introduction of the Christian idea of undeserved redemption for a crime where others were the real criminals. He stood firm on the ground of realism; and he only took the liberties with time that were demanded by the exigencies of the stage. This was done in order to deepen and broaden the tones of the picture,

and to follow in detail the course of human truth. Thus did the author fulfil the demands of art that flow from the vital needs of human thought and emotion.

## IV

After the Roman play Roztworowski essayed ever-new forms of dramatic composition, seeking in them expression for his religious views: his thoughts about union with God, as well as his pessimistic broodings about modern society. To the most interesting of these belongs the already mentioned *mysterium Mercy*, in which the introduction of the throng as the only actor was handled with rare power and skill. His next real triumph, however, was won when he returned to the classical forms of Greek tragedy, giving us in 1929 the four-act play *Surprise*. It is a picture of contemporary peasant life, and recalls the English work by George Lillo, *Fatal Curiosity* (1736), or the later German work by Werner, *Der vierundzwanzigster Februar* (1814). True, Roztworowski did not know these plays, even if the likeness of the theme seems to suggest this. He got his tale from an actual event reported by the daily Press from a court-room. A poor peasant woman is seeking means to educate her boy, and with this purpose in mind is led to the murder of an unknown guest from the New World, in the hope of getting his dollars. Too late she discovers that it is her own elder son, who had been abroad many years. Around this act of crime, whose dramatic irony recalls the horrors of *Œdipus*, the author wove a work of great beauty. The picture of primitive conditions drawn by the author is very close to everyday living, striking in richness of characters, infallible in its dealing with right and wrong, and deeply moving where the elemental forces of human passion are at work. Critics have not hesitated to call it a tragedy of motherhood in the classic sense; at once by its terseness and its tenderness one of the most convincing in all literature.

The further doings of the unfortunate family, the fate of the children over whose head hung the parental crime, were made the theme of two succeeding parts of a trilogy, *The Moving* (1930) and *At the Goal* (1932). Again, we have realistic efforts at a portrayal of society, this time of the realities of town conditions. The problem of the social climber, seeking to improve his position, is treated as a moral issue, and the general background is that of post-war conditions. But for Roztworowski, as before, the chief concern is the working of the Christian ethic, in whose name he tries to have the children expiate the sin of

their mother. The former of the two is a drama of sin and of healing, but in the third play in the trilogy this *motif* recedes before a grotesque vision of a new set of manners and customs, seen from their comic side. The lion's claws of the author are felt here too, notably in scenes that shake the conscience; while the nature of the social comedy to which these plays are akin gave Roztworowski a chance to try out a new tool from his bag, that of humour with a sharp satire behind it. On the same lines he attempted another social comedy, with the life behind the scenes of the stage as its subject; but, though it was finished, he did not live to produce it.

From his last years we have still one other work, *The Red March* (1936), a fragment taken from the French Revolution. We know that the problem of revolution had long disturbed his mind. Witness his words written in 1928:

"Seeing that the face of the French aristocracy of that time is that of the bourgeois today, I should like to use the revolution as a mirror of the present. One must keep society from suicide, one must go out to meet evil, and with Napoleonic principles; one must defend oneself from revolutions, which are always championed by the organised minority."

Out of this thought was born an original type of dramatic vision, to demonstrate in the short form of a play the planlessness of the crowd, bowing down before the idol of emancipation, and accepting with relief the absolutism of an Emperor.

The social tendency with which, on the basis of his pamphlets one might charge the poet, almost never stood in the way of his artistic genius. Perhaps the only exception in this regard was his anti-Semite *Antichrist* (1925). He had given indirect expression to this concept in his notion of the drama of life that man is always engaged in; and a sample of this could be seen in that most concentrated of his works, *Surprise*. Even his ardent patriotism, known to all and accepted strongly in what he wrote as in his speeches, rarely found direct utterance in his plays. Roztworowski was not, as some have declared, the most cosmopolitan of Polish poets; but he was a Pole, and at the same time a universalist. In all his work the line of thinking leads in a wide curve from man to God, and only touches the nation in passing from man, to touch the human race as it reaches to the Creator.

## OBITUARY

### ALEXANDER IVANOVICH KUPRIN (1870-1938)

WHEN, in the summer of 1937, Kuprin went back to Soviet Russia his departure produced a mild sensation in the Russian émigré circles. It was the first case of its kind; since the return, in 1922, of Alexis Tolstoy and Ilya Ehrenburg, and the much less unexpected, and at the same time more unobtrusive, return of Prince D. S. Mirsky in 1932, Kuprin was the first prominent literary figure to quit the ranks of emigration and go back. No political significance was, however, attached to his act. Those who knew him well, and were in touch with him during the months preceding his departure, knew that he was a sick and spent man who went to Russia in order to die there. He had often expressed his desire to die in his own country, in his beloved Gatchina, and not in the bitterness of exile. His desire has now been fulfilled, and he died there at the end of August, 1938, fourteen months after his return, apparently without producing anything new and keeping very much in the shadow.

Both as a writer and as a personality Kuprin was very popular. His writings reflected his personality—benevolent, humorous, jolly. A “realist” in literature, he was a romantic at heart, with a pronounced leaning to simple, strong, unsophisticated people like the fishermen of Balaklava among whom at one time he lived. Kuprin’s own life was not devoid of romanticism and after resigning his commission in the Army (he was educated at a Cadet College) he led a somewhat vagabond life and tasted of different professions before becoming a writer. His realistic art was permeated with the romance of everyday life and he had some points in common with Knut Hamsun, who was one of his favourite authors.

Though not a great writer, he deserves a conspicuous place in the literature of his time. His early stories, dealing mostly with army life, attracted Tolstoy’s favourable attention. His fame was acquired when he wrote *Poedinok* (*The Duel*). Coming, as it did, on the heels of the Russo-Japanese war (1905), this unflattering picture of the inner life of the Russian Army was bound to become the talk of the day. Kuprin was hailed as one of the hopes of the politically advanced realist school. The work will endure, however, not as a political or social picture, but because of some of its excellent character-drawing,



beginning with its unmilitary hero, Sub-Lieutenant Romashov. Character-drawing and story-telling were Kuprin's strong suit. The latter is well illustrated in such stories as *Captain Rybnikov* and *The Bracelet of Garnets*. Kuprin's famous long novel *Yama (The Pit)* had a success of sensation, but hardly belongs to his best work. In the emigration, where, until shortly before his return to Russia, he belonged to the staunchest anti-Communists, Kuprin did not write much: his increasing ill-health and the difficulties of emigrant life made themselves felt. Apart from some short stories, he wrote three short novels. *The Wheel of Time* is a story, told in the first person at a *bistrot* table by a man who describes himself as "an empty shell of a human being," of a love affair between a Russian émigré and a somewhat unusual Frenchwoman. It enables Kuprin to indulge in some not too deep generalisations on the subject of comparative national psychology, but the story itself, romantic and unusual, is well told. *Jeanette, or the Princess of Four Streets*—hardly a novel in size—is a touching story of the attachment of a lonely and eccentric émigré professor to a little Parisian girl, daughter of a woman newsagent. The characters of the Professor himself, of the girl's mother and of some other episodic Frenchmen, as well as the scenes of Parisian street life, are very well drawn. A simple, unsophisticated story, full of sense of life, it shows Kuprin almost at his former best. In his latest work—*Yunkera (Cadets)*—Kuprin drew upon his youthful impressions of life at a military school.

Most of Kuprin's work has been translated into foreign languages. His contribution to Russian literature, together with that of Bunin and Aldanov, two other leading émigré novelists, is discussed in a French book of Charles Ledré.

GLEB STRUVE.

### STANISLAW SZOBER

WITH the death of Szober in August last, the University of Warsaw lost an eminent philologist, and the Polish nation a devoted citizen. From the tributes paid to his memory by those who knew him best, the stranger who profited from his work in the field of language study and nurture can realize how greatly he was loved by his students, and how much he will be missed by his colleagues.

Graduating from the University of Moscow, he was active in the private schools of Warsaw for ten years before the war, and succeeded

to a place on the staff of the newly resurrected university in 1915. From 1918 he had charge of the Polish Language Seminar, which he held for ten years, passing then to be Head of the Seminar of Indo-European languages. As a pupil and younger colleague of Baudouin de Courtenay and of A. A. Kryński, he carried farther the best traditions of Polish philology, whether in the class-room or with his pen. As a Member of the Polish Academy of Sciences, and also of the Scientific Society, he took an active interest in their work and contributed greatly in his own field. He was editor of *Philological Papers*, and assisted with the editing of *A Guide to Language*.

His printed works range from a study of Polish orthography in 1917, and a sketch of the principles of philology in general (1924), to the High School Grammar used today by half of Poland (third edition 1931), and to a notable work published recently in two volumes in Polish, *Zycie Wyrazów* (the Life of Words). Finally, we have his latest achievement in *An Orthoepic Dictionary*. So much for the scientist, but Szober was also esteemed as a soldier and a citizen. Throughout all the struggle for independence and during the years of reconstruction, he did more than his share, notably in the capital which knew him best. His passing at 59 seems premature, but he lived out a whole life just the same.

W. J. R.

### TEODOR AXENTOWICZ

AFTER Wyczółkowski, now Axentowicz. The last of the older generation is gone; of that "race" of revolutionaries who turned Polish painting upside-down forty-five years ago, and made it a new power in the nation. In his eightieth year, and after a long illness Axentowicz passed away in the autumn. Born in Transylvania, he was schooled in Cracow, went on to study in Munich in 1878, and thence for over a decade to Paris. Frequent and longer visits to London interrupted this stay in France, and when—in 1895—he was called to help in the reorganization of the Academy of Fine Arts in Cracow, he took an English wife back with him. In Cracow he worked for forty years, and there he died.

Like his older colleague, he followed the fashion of the time and soon became a disciple of and master in the *genre*; witness his fine scenes from the daily round of the country people of Eastern Poland, to which we shall return below. But the years in Paris stirred up other talents and interests. He devoted himself in

particular to portraiture, studying under the skilled guidance of Duran. He was greatly attracted to Whistler, and scarcely less to the English masters of the 18th century. It was the success of his portrait of Sarah Bernhardt which drew the attention of the well-to-do both in Paris and in London, and he was in great demand for family portraits in the City.

Settling down in a time of transition in Cracow, he became a member of *Sztuka*—the Secessionist Group; to which belonged the rising geniuses of the day—Wyczółkowski and Fałat, as well as Wyspiański and Malczewski. In the "organ" of this group, *Zycie* (Life) published by Przybyszewski, many of the first works of Axentowicz were published. He became very soon the fashionable "master," his portraits, both of young girls of lyc  e age, and of society women, having won the admiration of everyone. Following the trend of the time, he turned to pastel instead of oil as a medium, and proved himself as consummate a master here as the greatest of the French. In the field of portraiture he has been put by competent critics beside the notable masters of modern times: the German Lenbach, the Hungarian Laszlo, the Russian Repin, the American Sargent (who did much work in England), and the supreme French genius Blanche. Not only did he draw with surety, but his sense of colour effects—both in contrast and in combination—was unusual. It was his misfortune, no doubt, that he was too much sought after: so that, as with not a few others, he produced too much, and a certain sameness crept into all he did.

For this reason, lovers of the elemental in art go back to the earlier Axentowicz, some would say the unspoiled one; and in particular to the powerful scenes from the everyday world of Ukraine. He loved both the open country, and the uplands of the Huculs. His "Consecration of the Spring" has not a whit less colour and fire than the corresponding works of Wyczółkowski. Beside it one could put his winter religious processions, often with the lovely timber churches of the Huculs in the background; or his "Funeral in Ruthenia," or his "Jordan's Saintsday." In a class by themselves are his numerous representations of that whirling folk-dance, the Oberek. About all these works there is something virile and distinctive, which one misses in his pictures of fair women, or even in his famous "The Artist's Family."

It is notable that, again like Wyczółkowski, Axentowicz began his more ambitious subjects with historical scenes—the influence of Matejko, no doubt. Two of them will last as distinctive, "The Taking of W  rzburg (by the French) in 1811," and "The Polish

Envoys to Henry of Valois in 1573." But the spirit of the day was leading away from this. The Secessionists preferred to make their work a national possession for its own sake—*l'art pour l'art*—rather than to use painting for national political ends. Their instinct was sound; and the last pre-war generation gave not only Poland but also her neighbour countries many a masterpiece which now adorns the wall of a new National Gallery in Central Europe.

W. J. R.

### AYLMER MAUDE

MANY will deeply regret the death of Mr. Aylmer Maude, the translator of Tolstoy, which occurred on 25 August, 1938. He was born in March, 1858, and was thus over eighty years of age when he died. At the age of sixteen he went to Russia, where he studied in the Lyceum; and on the completion of his schooling he remained in the country till 1897, first as tutor and then in business. Even after his return to England he never severed his connections with Russia. He again visited the country in 1918, when he went for a lecturing tour on behalf of the Y.M.C.A.

Although Aylmer Maude has written books on various subjects, he is best known as a translator and mentor of Tolstoy. By his translations in particular he has rendered a genuine service in making the great Russian writer known in the English-speaking countries. In addition to translating many of Tolstoy's works, he contributed to the Press numerous articles on his favourite author.

In 1908 he published his *Life of Tolstoy: The First Fifty Years*, and two years later appeared the second volume, dealing with the later years of Tolstoy's life. These two volumes soon assumed a special position among works on Tolstoy, and were justly regarded as the standard books on the great novelist. Maude disagreed with Tolstoy the social thinker on many important points. We are, of course, not concerned here with Aylmer Maude's political views or his objections to Tolstoy's opinions. The positive service he has rendered by making the great Russian writer better known here is so important that it would be irrelevant even to raise these issues. He helped a large number of people to "find" Tolstoy; and the fascination of the discovery was so great that to many it was the beginning of a study and close acquaintance with Russian literature in general and even with the language, in order to be able to read their favourite author in the original. Although there were other translators of Tolstoy, both in this country and in the United States, Maude's versions are of special merit. In addition to his thorough-

ness and his conscientious approach towards his self-imposed task, he had the considerable advantage of Tolstoy's acquaintance. Maude could discuss with the author intricate textual problems, the existence of which other translators may not even have suspected. This was particularly important in the works of the writer of a country where over-zealous censors often entirely distorted the original meaning of the text.

For forty years Maude set himself the task of reproducing with complete faithfulness Tolstoy's principal writings and of interpreting both his art and his teachings. He made this his mission, his life's work.

His *Life of Tolstoy* is not remarkable as a literary biography, but is clear and authoritative, if even at times over-critical. He interpreted sympathetically Tolstoy's moral principles as well as his rationalised religion and his doctrine of non-resistance to evil.

About two years ago he completed the important task of editing the Centenary Edition of Tolstoy's works, issued for the Tolstoy Society by the Oxford University Press, thus rendering a first class service to all lovers of the great writer. This edition will remain for many years to come a lasting monument of Maude's devotion to Tolstoy.

LOUIS SEGAL.

### FRANCIŠ P. MARCHANT

IN November, 1938, died rather suddenly Francis P. Marchant, whose memory will be cherished by all those who were in touch with efforts to make Czechoslovakia better known to the English-speaking publics. In 1901 he came first into contact with Czech nationalist tendencies and all his later years were devoted to an untiring attempt to further mutual intercourse and understanding between British and Czech circles. Students of the language and literature, student translators and interpreters we have had a few, but Francis P. Marchant was something more, something rarer than even the best-intentioned linguist or translator. He was of the brave and rare band of those who do not object to adding to their work as students the much more tiresome rôle of popular propagandist. At a moment's notice he was ready to collect his lantern, slides and lecture material and sally forth to halls and institutes of any kind where a public might possibly be found to imbibe some of his own knowledge and enthusiasm. It is in this guise of popular lecturer that our old friend will remain longest and most lovingly in the memory of old friends and associates.

Mr. Marchant was led to Czech studies through Russian. He was one of the small band of enthusiasts who supported the pioneer work of Mr. E. H. Cazalet, Founder and President of the Anglo-Russian Literary Society, which for many years carried almost alone in England the task of developing cultural relations with the Old Russia. The Society had many friends there, and received a letter of encouragement from Count Leo Tolstoy. Mr. Marchant, who did several verse translations from Russian, at one time served as Treasurer of this Society.

### KAREL ČAPEK

" . . . KAREL ČAPEK is still a comparatively young man at the height of his powers." Thus wrote Dr. René Wellek in his critical essay on Karel Čapek which was published in *The Slavonic and East European Review* for July, 1936. Nobody could have foreseen that, less than three years later, the man of whom these words were so appropriately written, would be no more. There can be little doubt that his death was a sequel to the disaster which befell his country in the autumn of 1938, and it is a tragic coincidence that the entry of the Germans into Vienna, an event which foreshadowed the possibility of havoc to Czechoslovakia, was likewise followed by the death of an eminent Czech author—Otakar Fischer, poet, dramatist, critic and translator.

Dr. Wellek's above-mentioned account of Čapek's work and the supplementary details which he included in his survey of Czech literature during the last twenty years<sup>1</sup> form such an admirable tribute to Čapek's versatile achievements as a writer that little on this score remains to be said here. It is, however, perhaps worth emphasising that, though Čapek was the first Czech author to become widely known outside the frontiers of his native country—and in this respect his rise to fame offers a striking analogy with Czechoslovakia's advance as an influential factor in the politics of post-war Europe—his full merits as a literary artist can be appreciated only by those who are acquainted with his work in Czech. No translation does thorough justice to his mastery of the Czech language, the resources of which he utilised so deftly and so variously. On the one hand, for example, there are his short stories, which reproduce the lilt and flavour of Czech as spoken by the man in the street, while in contrast to this racy vernacular there are his lyrical versions of modern French poets, from Baudelaire onwards, in which the diction is in each case attuned to the verbal melody of the original poem. Thus, a comparison of Verlaine's "*Écoutez la chanson bien douce*"

<sup>1</sup> *Slavonic Review*, No. 50, p. 340.

with Verhaeren's "L'arbre," as rendered into Czech by Čapek, shows how admirably the differences of style between the two poets have been conveyed in a linguistic medium so different in structure and phonology from theirs. Hence, no account of Čapek would be complete which omitted to stress his devotion to his native language. He was familiar with it in all its aspects—its wealth of racy idiom, its subtleties, its byways, its slang, the breadth and depth of its lyrical range—and in an eloquent essay he paid tribute to its strength and beauty. Čapek was, in fact, a far greater literary artist than one or two English critics, to judge by what they have recently written about him, seem to realise. To quote Dr. Wellek once more :

"In a few books Karel Čapek has achieved real greatness, even measured by the highest standards. And obviously he should be judged by his best."

Here I may perhaps be allowed to make some brief references to my last meeting with Čapek. It took place on Sunday, 11 September, 1938, at the country house where he had happily settled down at some distance from Prague. Tension lay heavily in the atmosphere that day. The whole of Czechoslovakia was anxiously awaiting Hitler's fateful Nuremberg speech, and this sense of mis-giving had communicated itself to the group of Čapek's friends who had come to visit him. I had the impression, however, that the uneasy mood which prevailed affected Čapek only to a slight extent. He did not avoid the topic which haunted the minds of everyone there, but, perhaps by way of easing our thoughts, he likewise discussed his plans for arranging the spacious grounds which adjoined the house. There was, I recall, a pergola which he had already begun to put into shape, and he intended also to make the most of the waterfall which formed a picturesque feature of the stream flowing near the house. I remember, too, how he gave a remarkable demonstration of his powers as a water-diviner. These may be trivial details, but viewed now in retrospect, they assume a pathetic significance which renders them unforgettable.

Čapek's untimely death has inflicted a grievous loss not only upon his own country, but upon all those with any appreciation of the humanities, in the fullest sense of the word. How grievous that loss is, cannot be assessed. His creative powers would, beyond any doubt, have developed increasingly if he had lived, and it may reasonably be assumed that the literary work which bears his name, considerable as it is, would then have been but the prelude to even higher achievement.

PAUL SELVER.

# SOVIET LEGISLATION

*Decree of the Presidium of the Supreme Council of the USSR.*

## **On the Introduction of Labour Booklets.**

With the object of regulating the registration of workers and employees in concerns and institutions, the Council of People's Commissars of the USSR decrees:

1. To introduce as from 15 January, 1939, for workers and employees in all State and co-operative concerns and institutions Labour booklets, issued by the administrative board of the concern (institution).

2. Labour booklets to contain the following data concerning the owner of the Labour booklet: surname, name and patronymic, age, education, profession, and information concerning his work and movements from one concern (institution) to another, the causes of such transfers, and also of encouragements and rewards received.

3. To ratify the form of the Labour booklet.

4. The Labour booklets are issued according to a uniform pattern for the entire USSR. The text of the Labour booklets is printed in Russian and in the languages of the Union or Autonomous Republic concerned.

5. The entries in the Labour booklets are made in the language used for business procedure in the given concern (institution). In the event of business procedure being conducted in the language of a Union or Autonomous Republic, the entries in the Labour booklet are also made in Russian.

6. Workers and employees, when signing on, must produce their Labour booklets for inspection by the managing board of the concern (institution). The managing board have the right to engage workers and employees only if the latter present their Labour booklets.

Persons signing on for work for the first time must produce for the managing board a reference from their house-board or village council concerning their previous occupation.

7. The managing boards of concerns and institutions must complete the issue of Labour booklets to their workers and employees by 15 January, 1939.

Persons signing on for work for the first time at a later date must obtain a Labour booklet not later than 5 days after signing on for work.

8. Labour booklets must be kept for all workers and employees working in a concern (institution) for more than 5 days, including seasonal and temporary workers.

9. The Labour booklet is kept by the management of the concern (institution), and is returned to the worker or employee on his dismissal.

10. The Labour booklets are filled in by the management of the concerns and institutions in conformity with the following regulations:

(a) Year of birth, and middle or higher education, are registered only on the strength of documentary evidence. Elementary education



may be registered on the strength of a verbal statement by the worker or employee.

(b) Under the heading "Profession," the basic profession is registered on the strength of a personal statement by the worker or employee.

(c) In the section "Data concerning work," the following entry is primarily made under heading 3. "The total period of hired labour, accomplished prior to entering the concern (institution) issuing the Labour booklet, amounts to so many years." Under heading 4 the following is correspondingly entered: "A period of so many years is confirmed by documents, and registered on the strength of verbal statements, so many."

(d) Next is entered, as a heading, the name of the concern (institution) issuing the Labour booklet.

Under this heading are entered the date of admission to employment in the given concern (institution) and all former transfers which took place prior to the filling-in of the Labour booklet.

The entries in the section "Data concerning work" are made as follows: heading 2 contains the date of admission to employment, transfers and dismissals, heading 3 states: "Admitted to such and such a guild (shop, section) in such and such a capacity," or "Dismissed for such and such a cause", the cause of dismissal to be cited in exact conformity with the formulas of the Labour Code or as a reference to an article (point) of the said Code; heading 4 contains a reference to the order for admission to employment, transfer or dismissal.

All entries after the issue of the Labour booklet must be made by the management immediately after every order or disposition.

All entries are similarly formulated in every subsequent place of employment.

Fines are not entered in the Labour booklet.

(e) Commendations and rewards are entered from the date of admission to employment in the concern (institution) which issued the Labour booklet. Only occasional individual commendations and rewards connected with work in the concern (institution) are entered. Premiums provided for by the wage system are not entered.

(f) On dismissal, all data concerning work, commendations and rewards entered during the period of employment in the concern (institution) are certified by the signature of the manager (or a specially delegated official) and the seal of the concern (institution).

(g) All entries in the Labour booklets are made in ink.

11. The recipient is charged a fee of 50 kopecks upon the issue of a Labour booklet by the management of the concern (institution).

12. In the event of the loss of a Labour booklet through carelessness, the owner is fined 25 roubles by the management of the concern (institution).

On the loss of a Labour booklet, the owner must immediately report

to the management (of his most recent place of employment). Not later than 15 days after this intimation, the management issues a new Labour booklet marked "Duplicate."

13. All sums received both as payment for, or fines for the loss of, Labour booklets are scheduled as State revenue.

14. Illegal use of Labour booklets, their transference to other persons, forgery and tampering with them are punishable under the Criminal Code.

15. Concerns and institutions are provided with the necessary supply of Labour booklets by their respective commissariats.

16. The Decree of the Council of People's Commissars of the USSR, 21 September, 1926, "On Labour Registers" (Code of Laws of the USSR, 1926, No. 66, Art. 502; 1929, No. 35, Art. 315) is annulled.

Signed :

President of the Council of People's Commissars of the USSR.

V. MOLOTOV.

Director of Affairs of the Council of People's Commissars of the USSR.

I. BOLSHAKOV.

Moscow, the Kremlin.

20 December, 1938.

(A facsimile of the Labour booklet is reproduced.)

(*Izvestia*, 21 December, 1938, No. 294 (6761).)

*Decree of the Presidium of the Supreme Council of the USSR.*

**On Establishing a Supreme Grade of Distinction—the Rank of Hero of Socialist Labour.**

1. To establish a supreme grade of distinction in the sphere of economic and cultural construction—the rank of Hero of Socialist Labour.

2. Persons promoted to the rank of Hero of Socialist Labour are simultaneously awarded the Order of Lenin.

3. To approve the Statute of the rank of Hero of Socialist Labour. President of the Presidium of the Supreme Council of the USSR.

(Signed) M. KALININ.

Secretary of the Presidium of the Supreme Council of the USSR.

(Signed) A. GORKIN.

Moscow, the Kremlin.

27 December, 1938.

(*Izvestia*, 28 December, 1938, No. 300 (6767).)

### **Statute of the Rank of "Hero of Socialist Labour."**

1. The rank of Hero of Socialist Labour represents the highest grade of distinction in the sphere of economic and cultural construction, and is awarded to persons who by their specially distinguished pioneer work in the sphere of industry, agriculture, transport, trade, scientific discovery and technical invention have rendered exceptional service to the State, promoted the progress of the national economy, culture, science and the growth of the power and glory of the USSR.

2. The rank of Hero of Socialist Labour is awarded by the Presidium of the Supreme Council of the USSR.

3. The Hero of Socialist Labour is awarded :

(a) the highest award in the USSR—the Order of Lenin.

(b) a special diploma of the Presidium of the Supreme Council of the USSR.

4. The Order of Lenin received simultaneously with the rank of Hero of Socialist Labour entitles the recipient to a cash bonus amounting to twice his wages.

5. The Hero of Socialist Labour is entitled to the rights and privileges stipulated in Articles 10-16 of the General Statute of Orders of the USSR (Code of Laws of the USSR, No. 24, Art. 220-b.).

6. The Hero of Socialist Labour may be deprived of his rank only by order of the Presidium of the Supreme Council of the USSR.

President of the Presidium of the Supreme Council of the USSR.

(Signed) M. KALININ.

Secretary of the Presidium of the Supreme Council of the USSR.

(Signed) A. GORKIN.

Moscow, the Kremlin.

27 December, 1938.

(*Izvestia*, 28 December, 1938, No. 300 (6767).)

The same issue of the *Izvestia* contains two decrees of the Presidium of the Supreme Council of the USSR, establishing two medals: "For Labour Valour" and "For Labour Distinction" for efficient workers. Both orders carry with them certain pecuniary and social advantages and privileges.

*Decree of the Council of People's Commissars of the USSR, the Central Committee of the All-Union Communist (Bolshevik) Party and the All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions.*

### **On measures for Regulating Labour Discipline, Improving the Practice of State Social Insurance and Combating Abuses in that Sphere.**

Toilers in the Soviet Union work not for capitalists, but for themselves, for their Socialist State, for the good of the whole people. The overwhelming majority of workers and employees are working honestly

and conscientiously in factories, on transport and in institutions, giving proof of a conscious attitude towards labour, setting examples of shock-methods and labour valour, and strengthening the might and defensive power of the Motherland.

Alongside honest and conscientious workers there still exist, however, non-conscious, backward or unconscientious individuals—quitters, loafers, absentees and grafters.

These persons, by their unconscientious work, absenteeism, late arrival at work, aimless wandering about the premises during working hours and other infringements of the internal working regulations, and also by their frequent arbitrary moves from one concern to another, disrupt labour discipline and do great damage to industry, transport and the entire national economy.

Their object is to give the State as little work and to snatch for themselves as much money as possible. They abuse the Soviet Labour laws and regulations by using them in their own greedy interests. They do not work even the full stipulated hours of the labour day, and frequently work only four or five hours, wasting the remaining two or three working hours. Thus millions of working days and milliards of roubles are annually lost to the State and nation.

When dismissed, such quitters and loafers start prevaricating, and while remaining idle claim wages for alleged involuntary absence. Dismissal for violation of labour discipline does not, as a general rule, constitute a really efficient punishment for such truants, as in the majority of cases they immediately obtain employment in other concerns.

By taking advantage of the existing holiday regulations, by which the right to a holiday is granted after five and a half months' employment in a concern or institution, quitters and loafers, moving from one concern to another, manage to obtain two holidays a year, thus gaining a privileged position as compared with conscientious workers and employees.

Flats in tenements built by works and factories for their workers and employees are frequently occupied by persons who have arbitrarily thrown up their jobs or been dismissed for violation of labour discipline, as a result of which workers and employees with a long and good record of work in a single concern find themselves again and again deprived of dwelling accommodation.

With regard to the distribution of travel vouchers to rest-homes and sanatoria, quitters and loafers enjoy equal rights with conscientious, diligent employees and workers. Similarly, in the payment of insurance grants for temporary disablement or in the granting of pensions, the necessary distinction is not made between conscientious workers with a long record of uninterrupted employment in a given concern or institution, and violators of labour discipline, quitters who shift from one concern or institution to another.

Certain trade-union, economic and also judicial organs manifest an

intolerable, nationally harmful leniency towards such violators of labour discipline, and even encourage them, against the interests of the people and the State, by frequently deciding cases concerned with reinstatement in employment, the payment of grants for temporary disablement, eviction from factory tenements, etc., in favour of quitters and absentees.

All this leads to a situation in which unconscientious workers, while doing little work, can live at the expense of the State and nation, thereby evoking just protests from the majority of workers and employees. Certain modifications in the existing regulations of the internal labour order and the rates of social insurance are thereby called for, in order henceforth to prevent the equal treatment of conscientious workers on the one hand, and loafers and quitters on the other, and to ensure that only honest, diligent workers should be encouraged, as opposed to those who undermine labour discipline and shift insouciantly from one concern to another.

Grave abuses also exist in the practice of obtaining leave during pregnancy and confinement. Cases are frequent when women, desirous of benefiting from the State by fraud, take up employment in a concern or institution shortly before confinement, with the sole object of obtaining a four months' leave at State expense and never intending to return to work. The interests of the State demand that such abuses should immediately be stopped.

The Council of People's Commissars of the USSR, the Central Committee of the All-Union Communist (Bolshevik) Party and the All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions resolve

1. To compel the management of concerns and institutions, in conjunction with trade-union organs, to engage in a decisive campaign against all violators of labour discipline and internal labour regulations, against truants, loafers, grafters, and all dishonest shirkers of their labour duties, whether employees or workers.

The law lays down that a worker or employee absent for no valid reason should be dismissed. This measure is directed against slackers who do not wish to work, but prefer to live at the expense of the State and nation. The injunction of the law concerning the dismissal of truants must be obeyed to the letter. An eight-hour working day, a seven-hour working day and a six-hour working day, according to the nature of the work in different industries and institutions, have been established by Law and accepted by Labour. The State demands, and Labour supports this demand, that the duration of the working day established by Law should be exactly maintained without any infringements, so that in concerns with an eight-hour, seven-hour or six-hour working day, work should proceed according to the Law for the full eight, seven or six hours. Late arrival, premature departure for dinner, late return

from dinner, premature cessation of work, as well as loafing during working hours, all these constitute a most grave violation of labour discipline, a violation of the Law, which tends to undermine the economic and defensive power of the country and the welfare of the nation.

The worker or employee who for no valid reason arrives late at work or leaves prematurely for dinner, or arrives late after dinner, or prematurely leaves his factory or office, or loafs during working hours, is subjected to administrative correction : remonstrance or rebuke with warning of dismissal ; transference to another, lower-paid work for a period up to three months, or degradation to an inferior post.

The worker or employee guilty of three such acts within one month, or four acts within two consecutive months, is liable to dismissal as a truant and a violator of Labour Law and Labour discipline.

2. To lay it down that, for failure to introduce measures for strengthening labour discipline and against truants, quitters and slackers, in accordance with the present Decree and the Decree of the Central Executive Committee and the Council of People's Commissars of the USSR of 15 November, 1932, " On Dismissal for Absenteeism without Valid Reason " (Code of Laws, USSR, 1932, No. 78, Art. 475), heads of concerns, institutions, guilds and departments are liable to be held responsible by superior organs, censured, dismissed from their posts and sent for trial.

3. Workers and employees wishing to leave must give a month's notice to the management of the concern or institution.

4. In the case of a worker or employee being dismissed without sufficient cause, the remuneration for an unavoidable absence is made at the average rate of wages, but for not more than twenty days. The management of concerns and institutions, factory committees, local committees and price-settling commissions must examine appeals concerning unfair dismissal within three days from the lodging of the appeal—judicial courts within five days.

5. Workers and employees, members of a trade union, receive the following benefits for temporary disablement (exclusive of benefits for pregnancy and confinement), in proportion to their term of continuous employment in a given concern or institution :

(a)	Continuous employment in the same concern or institution ...	over 6 years—100% wages
(b)	„ „ „ ..	3 to 6 years— 80% „
(c)	„ „ „ ...	2 to 3 years— 60% „
(d)	„ „ „	up to 2 years— 50% „

6. Juveniles up to 18 years, members of trade unions, receive benefits as enumerated in Art. 5 (exclusive of benefits for pregnancy and confinements), in proportion to their term of continuous employment in a given concern or institution, in the following proportion: for continuous employment for over two years—80% wages; up to two

years—60% wages. The period of training in the factory apprentice-school is included in the period of continuous employment.

7. Underground workers in the coal-mining industry, members of the trade union, employed in coal-extracting or auxiliary (preparatory) work in the pits, receive the benefits enumerated in Art. 5 in proportion to their continuous employment in a given mine as follows: for continuous employment for over two years—100% wages; up to two years—60% wages.

8. In works and factories opened after 1 January, 1933, workers and employees, members of a trade union, who entered the concern not later than 1 January, 1936, and continuously employed there since, receive the following relief for temporary disablement (exclusive of benefits for pregnancy and confinement), in proportion to their term of continuous employment in a given concern: for continuous employment for over five years—100% wages; three to five years—80% wages. Workers and employees of such concerns with a term of continuous employment below three years are scheduled for benefits for temporary disablement according to the regulations laid down in Art. 5 of the present Decree.

9. Workers and employees, not members of a trade union, receive benefits for temporary disablement (exclusive of benefits for pregnancy and confinement) to the amount of 50% of the standards fixed for members of trade unions.

10. In granting benefits for temporary disablement, a term of employment is counted as continuous in the event of a worker or employee being transferred from one concern or institution to another by order of the management of the economic body or institution.

11. Workers and employees dismissed for violation of labour discipline or for crime, as well as those leaving of their own choice, are entitled to benefits for temporary disablement after working in a new place for not less than six months. These regulations do not apply to workers and employees who have been dismissed or arbitrarily abandoned their work prior to the publication of the present Decree.

12. On the strength of Art. 31 of the Decree of the CEC and CPC of the USSR of 17 October, 1937, "On the Preservation and Improvement of Housing Economy in Towns" (Code of Laws of the USSR, 1937, No. 69, Art. 314) it is laid down that workers and employees, who in connexion with their work in a given concern are allotted housing accommodation in tenements belonging to State concerns, institutions or public organisations (or in houses leased by the said concerns or institutions), in the event of their leaving the concern or institution of their own choice or being dismissed for violation of labour discipline, or for crime, after the publication of the present Decree, are liable to compulsory eviction within ten days, by order, without allocation of other housing accommodation.

13. The right to a holiday is granted to workers and employees after eleven months' continuous employment in a given concern or institution.

14. Over and above the fixed annual holiday, women workers and employees, in the event of pregnancy and confinement, are granted leave for 35 days prior to, and 28 days following, confinement, with payment of benefit at the expense of the State according to rates as fixed before. The said leave and benefits for pregnancy and confinement are granted to those who have been in continuous employment in a given concern (institution) for no less than seven months.

15. Priority claims for the allocation of vouchers for rest-homes is granted to those workers and employees who have been in continuous employment in a given concern or institution for over two years.

16. Leave of absence on account of temporary disablement (illness, pregnancy and confinement, etc.), uncompleted on the day of publication of the present Decree, is granted and remunerated according to the regulations in force at the initial date of leave.

17. With regard to workers and employees working for private employers (domestic assistants, workers and employees on concessions), the questions dealt with in the present Decree are regulated by special regulations issued by the All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions with the approval of the Council of People's Commissars of the USSR.

18. For the disabled of the I and II groups (general diseases) the following sliding scale of increases is established for terms of continuous employment in one concern or institution before applying for a pension:

Category.	Continuous employment.	Bonus as percentage of established pension.
I. Workers and employees engaged in underground and harmful work.	3 to 5 years	10%
	5 to 10 years	20%
	over 10 years	25%
II. Workers and employees in the metallurgical, machine-building, electrical, coal-mining, mining, oil, basic chemical and rubber industries, railway and water transport and productive G.P.O. concerns.	4 to 8 years	10%
	8 to 12 years	15%
	over 12 years	20%
III. All other workers and employees.	5 to 10 years	10%
	10 to 15 years	15%
	over 15 years	20%

Pensioners with a record of continuous employment in one concern or institution of over 5 years prior to application for a pension are



granted priority rights for obtaining health-resort vouchers allocated for pensioners.

19. Pensions for disablement are allocated to workers and employees in accordance with the following records of employment :

Age.	Record.		
	Men.	Women.	Engaged in underground and harmful work.
20 to 22 years	3	2	2
22 „ 25 „	4	3	3
25 „ 30 „	6	4	4
30 „ 35 „	8	5	5
35 „ 40 „	10	7	6
40 „ 45 „	12	9	7
45 „ 50 „	14	11	8
50 „ 55 „	16	13	10
55 „ 60 „	18	14	12
Over 60 „	20	15	14

In cases of disablement occurring before the age of 20, and likewise of disablement from a labour casualty or industrial disease, pensions are allocated irrespective of the period of employment.

20. Pensioners who continue to work while receiving an old-age pension retain the pension irrespective of their wages

Earned income up to 100 roubles a month received by the disabled of the I and II groups for work at home, provided by the co-operative association of the disabled, is likewise not taken into account; in cases where the earnings of the disabled exceed 100 roubles a month, the pension is proportionately reduced, not less than 50% of the pension being, however, retained by the disabled pensioner.

21. In connexion with the fixing of premiums for a continuous labour-record, and privileges in the reckoning of the earnings of pensioners (Articles 18 and 20 of the present Decree), all premiums and revised reckonings, as laid down in Articles 4, 6, 8, 13, 19 and 20 of the Ordinances of the Union Council of Social Insurance, 22 February, 1922, No. 47, with regard to all forms of pensions and all disablement groups, are abolished.

Premiums previously established are to remain unaltered

22. Pensioners who conceal from the social-welfare authorities their earnings or other incomes, subject to reckoning on the receipt of pensions, are deprived of pensions for six months.

23. In view of the fact that, alongside the general high standard of social provision in the USSR, there exist pensioners whose pensions were granted many years ago, when the rates of pensions and the

standards of wages were considerably below those of the present day, to establish that the State social-insurance pension, irrespective of the date of its allocation, should not fall below the following rates (inclusive of all premiums):

Category of pensioners.	Having no disabled members in the family.	Having one disabled member in the family	Having two or more disabled members in the family.
Pensioners receiving pensions for old age or on completion of service, and disabled of Group I.	50 roubles	60 roubles	75 roubles
Disabled group II	40 roubles	50 roubles	60 roubles
Families which have lost the wage-earner.	—	30 roubles	40 roubles

Social-insurance pensions for the disabled of group III to be not less than 25 roubles a month

24. The cost of the payment of pensions and relief to pensioners not employed in concerns or institutions and receiving social-insurance pensions, and likewise expenses for convalescence and rest-home services for the said pensioners, are to be met by the social-insurance organs from the State social-insurance funds.

25. The whole residue of State social-insurance funds accruing in connexion with the introduction of the present Decree is to be allotted by the trade unions to the additional construction of tenements for workers and employees, crèches and children's welfare-centres, over and above the funds allotted thereto by the Government.

26. The present Decree enters into force on 1 January, 1939.

President of the Council of People's Commissars of the USSR.

(Signed) V. MOLOTOV.

Secretary of the Central Committee of the All-Union Communist (Bolshevik) Party.

(Signed) J. STALIN.

Secretary of the All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions

(Signed) N. SHVERNIK.

28 December, 1938.

(*Izvestia*, 29 December, 1938, No. 301 (6768).)

# CHRONICLE

## UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

### *Diplomatic Relations with Hungary Broken Off*

As a result of the Munich agreement and the later decision of Hungary to join the Anti-Communist front, the Soviet Government, early in February, decided to close its Legation in Budapest, and the Hungarian mission in Moscow was closed. The necessary relations are carried on by subordinate officials of the two Legations.

### *Japanese-Soviet Negotiations on Fisheries*

The Japanese Ambassador in Moscow conferred with M. Litvinov on the 11 and 13 January, proposing a new convention on fishing rights in return for an early and favourable decision by Japan on the postponed payments for the Chinese Eastern Railway purchased by Japan. When the Soviet Minister rejected this proposal, the Japanese proposed a one-year agreement. To this M. Litvinov agreed, while insisting that the Chinese Eastern Railway payment should be dealt with promptly on its own merits.

### *Twentieth Anniversary of Soviet Belorussia*

On 1 January, the capital of Belorussia, Minsk, and the Soviet Press celebrated the twentieth anniversary of the establishment of the Soviet power in Belorussia (White Russia). This referred to the expulsion of the German and Polish forces which had held the country since the Brest-Litovsk Treaty, and the Press emphasised the harshness of that occupation. The Soviet Press has paid no attention to the agitation in the European and American papers relative to Ukraine, and made no mention of National Socialist aspirations even during the heat of this agitation.

### *New Army Oath*

A new oath for the armed forces of the Soviet Republic was announced by decree dated 3 January, 1939, and published the next day. The oath declares readiness "to fulfil all military rules and orders of commanders, commissaries and superiors (*nachalniki*)," also "to my last breath to be loyal to my People, my Soviet Homeland and the Workers and Peasants' Government." "I am always ready, on the order of the Workers and Peasants' Government, to stand forth for the defence of my Homeland—the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics." An accompanying decree of the same date gave instructions regarding the manner of administering the oath. Each individual in the army was to take the oath personally and sign his name to its text.

### *Emphasis on National Patriotism*

Three books appearing late in 1938, *Soviet Patriotism*, *Patriots* and *How we Beat the Japanese*, all urge the duty of Soviet citizens to place

the "defence of the Fatherland" first in their scale of values. Among the heroes cited as exemplary are Kutuzov and Suvorov.

#### *New Decorations Awarded*

Over twenty full pages of *Pravda* between 4 and 22 February were given to the names of individuals and organisations decorated for outstanding service in industry or agriculture. Six different decorations are now listed: The Order of Lenin, The Order of the Workers' Red Flag, The Red Star, The Mark of Honour, the Medal "For Valiant Effort," and that for "Distinguished Effort."

#### *New Administrative Divisions in Ukraine*

The Moscow papers on 11 January, 1939, published without comment the decree of the Presidium of the Supreme Council of the USSR establishing three administrative districts (*oblasti*) in the Ukrainian Republic. Sum, Kirovograd and Zaporozhe.

#### *Changes in the Administrative System*

By decree of 2 January, 1939, the Commissariat of Light Industry was reorganised into two separate commissariats. Textile Industry, to embrace cotton, wool, linen, jute, silk, artificial silk, manufacturing and products; Light Industry, embracing leather and footwear, tailoring, knitting, and the remaining undertakings hitherto pertaining to this Commissariat. On 11 January a decree similarly reorganised the Commissariat of Defence Industry into four separate national Commissariats: (1) Aviation Industry (M. M. Kaganovich), (2) Ship-building industry, (3) Military supply, embracing powder and ammunition, and (4) Armaments, embracing artillery, rifles and optical industry. By decree of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, 19 January, 1939, the Commissariat of Food Industry was divided into three separate commissariats: (1) Fisheries Industry, with Polina Zhemchuzhnikova as People's Commissary, (2) Meat and Milk Industry, and (3) Food Industry. The Commissariat of Heavy Industry was similarly divided by decree of 24 January, 1939. (1) Fuel, with Lazar Kaganovich as People's Commissary; (2) Electrical Stations and Electrical Industry; (3) Crude Metallurgy; (4) Fine Metallurgy; (5) Chemical Industry; (6) Construction-materials Industry.

#### *Eighteenth Party Congress*

The next All-Union Party Congress is summoned to meet on 10 March, 1939. The Seventeenth Congress took place in 1934. Apart from the reports to be given by Stalin, Vladimirovsky, for the Revision Commission, and Manuilsky for the Control Commission, the chief items on the programme are discussion of the Third Five-Year Plan (1938-42) and proposed changes in the Party Constitution. Theses on these two subjects, by Molotov and Zhdanov respectively, were published on 30 January and 10 February. "Discussion Sheets" were re-established

in *Pravda* "where critical articles, corrections and concrete proposals related to the theses are to be published."

### *Census*

The general census was taken on 17 January. For more than a week the censors had been making preliminary visits, and during the following week examiners and controllers checked the results. On 24 January the census in cities was reported to have been completed. The definite conclusion of actual census-taking was announced on 5 February. No figures have been published, but, except for a few minor faults noted at the beginning, the census is reported to have been successful. The final results are to be ready by 1 June, 1940.

### *Industrial Production for 1938*

A tentative report on industrial production given in a statement published in Moscow on 17 January shows an increase of 12 per cent. over 1937

	1937	1938	% to 1937
Total for the USSR .. .. .	69,188.5	77,520.3	112.7
Commissariats of Heavy Industry .. }			
"    " Machinery .. }	36,824.1	42,517.0	115.1
"    " Defence .. }			
Forests .. .. .	3,005.7	2,890.6	96.1
Light Industry . . . . .	14,508.0	15,300.5	105.5
Food Industry .. .. .	12,802.9	14,747.4	115.2
Grain Delivery .. .. .	1,947.8	2,064.8	106.0

The figures are in 1926/27 prices and in millions of roubles.

### *Coal Production Increase for 1939*

Soviet Press articles on the 1939 plan for increasing coal production emphasise two main defects in mining. The first is insufficient use of machines, either because of tardy repair and hence unusable apparatus, or because of a widespread prejudice among miners against machinery in general. The second deficiency is in the training of miners in the proper use of mechanical equipment. To combat these weaknesses in coal-production special six-month courses of instruction are ordered, as well as intensified political agitation among miners.

### *The Volga-Baltic Waterway*

One of the items to be discussed at the 18th Party Congress is the Volga-Baltic Waterway. Under study since 1933, the present project was officially approved by the Soviet of People's Commissaries in September 1935. It proposes the reconstruction of the Mariinsky Canal which is to be widened, deepened and provided with new locks. The increased size of barges and the better speed possible in the new canal will increase its capacity from 2 million to 25 million tons per year, cut the transport expense in half, and greatly reduce the time of transport between Leningrad and Rybinsk.

*Labour Discipline*

A number of decrees and official resolutions have been published during December and January aiming at improvement of labour discipline. *Pravda* called attention to Stalin's speech at the first Conference of collective-farm *udarniki* (shock-workers), in 1934, when he said: "It is sometimes asked, if we have Socialism, why should we still work? We worked before, we work now, but is it not time to ease off work?" This attitude toward work, as something undesirable, is severely condemned, and the privilege and joy of work is upheld, along with the fact that the right to work is one of the rights of Soviet citizens, granted by the Constitution. Apart from such theoretical considerations, the Press and the decrees emphasise other more practical ones. Thus tardiness, truancy and the labour turnover in the Trekhgorny Textile works during nine months of 1938 resulted in non-production of six million metres of cloth, or "about 600,000 persons might have bought ten metres each." On the positive side, loafing and tardiness, etc., must be overcome if production is to be raised from 95 billion to 180 billion roubles annually by the end of the Third Five-Year Plan, 1942.

To meet this situation, the Government carried on a month's discussion in the great papers. On 20 December a decree appeared establishing a system of individual work-passports for all industrial and office workers. This was essential in order to provide means of control. The second decree appeared on 27 December, establishing a new award—Hero of Socialist Labour—the recipient being entitled to the "Order of Lenin." Two new medals were created: (1) "For Labour Valour," and (2) "For Labour Excellence." Both carry monthly cash awards (Rs. 10 and 5 respectively), together with free passes on all city tram lines.<sup>1</sup>

On 29 December a comprehensive decree was published, signed jointly by the Sovnarkom, the Central Committee of the Party, and the Central Council of Trade Unions. It consists of 25 sections, of which the following are of peculiar significance:—

1. "The worker or office worker late at work without good excuse, or leaving early for dinner, or late after dinner, or leaving early from factory or office, or loitering in working hours, is subject to administrative punishment: reproof or reprimand, or reprimand with warning of dismissal; transfer to other lower-paid work for 3 months, or reduction to a lower position. The worker or office worker who commits three such faults in one month or four in two months is to be dismissed as a loafer, for having broken the law on labour and labour discipline."

2. "For failure to enforce measures for strengthening labour discipline . . . the directors of factories, institutions, shifts or departments are held responsible, up to dismissal from work and arraignment in the courts."

---

<sup>1</sup> See pp. 699-700.

3. Voluntary release requires one month's notice, regardless of the position held.

4. Payments for time off due to sickness differ in proportion to length of service in the present factory or office.

5. Workers and office-workers who are not members of trade unions receive half of the standard sick compensation.

6. Workers or office workers lodged in houses belonging to the enterprise employing them leave such lodgings within ten days after release, whether voluntary or forced dismissal, and have no claim for substitute lodgings.

7. Regular vacations are granted only after 11 months (instead of  $5\frac{1}{2}$ ) of work in a given enterprise or office.

8. Maternity paid-time is reduced from four months to "35 calendar days before giving birth and 28 calendar days after giving birth."

9. Social insurance payments to invalids and retired pensioners are in proportion to length of continuous service. Invalids or pensioners who hide the fact of profitable employment while drawing State insurance will lose 6 months' payments.

10. The labour-conflict commissions and the courts must decide cases within 3 and 5 days respectively.

To meet inquiries, a further decree on 9 January clarified the meaning of tardiness. up to 20 minutes is tardiness, more than 20 minutes counts as absence and "results in immediate dismissal." By the middle of January the several Commissariats began issuing their own decisions, chiefly punishing managers of factories or officers for leniency in applying the decree.

#### *Relations between Machine Tractor Stations and Collective Farms*

Two decrees issued jointly 13 January, 1939, by the Sovnarkom and the Central Committee of the Party have great significance for Soviet agriculture. The object is apparently twofold: to improve labour discipline and to increase production.

(1) The State will now guarantee tractor drivers Rs. 2.50 per working day, while the collective farms will still pay the balance, if any, due to the tractorist for his day's work. As a result of delays in paying wages to tractorists (Rs. 206,000,000 were owing in this way at 15 November, 1938), many of these key workers for agriculture were seeking other employment. By guaranteeing them a reasonable wage, they are expected to remain.

(2) The decrees call for a review of the contract system between the tractor stations and the collective farms, clearly defining their respective responsibilities and especially the quality of MTS work. The new contracts will have the force of law.

(3) The amount of payment in kind by the collective farm to its tractor station is an agreed percentage of the harvest. The grain thus procured is turned over to the State grain-collecting system at a fixed

price, and the MTS is thus really no more than an institution for grain collection. The State budget pays the entire cost of the MTS direct from State funds. Since the MTS do not depend directly upon the harvest, they have apparently become careless as regards quality of work. Therefore the tractor station is now required by law to do its part (deeper ploughing, early ploughing, etc.) in order to increase production.

(4) The directors of tractor stations are given funds for granting premiums to agronomists, book-keepers, and other technical and administrative workers, for personal efforts in increasing production; they are also subject to fines and deductions for failure to maintain the quality of work.

#### *Collective Farms Restricted to Farming*

The Soviet of People's Commissaries has issued an order to "liquidate all business enterprises in the kolhozy not connected with agricultural production." Numerous articles in the Press explain that many collective farms, or their officers, have been engaged in such non-agricultural business ventures as the manufacture of iron furniture, fireworks, insect-powder, or dyes. Another collective farm was publishing a fashion magazine and selling patterns "in every large city in the Union." Many of these ventures proved disastrous to the finances of the collective farm involved, but even where they yielded a profit, the Government holds that they distract farmers from their proper tasks in productive agriculture.

#### *Study of Marxism-Leninism*

At the second half of the current academic year, the faculties of law and economics will withdraw their courses in political economy and in dialectical and historical materialism, and substitute a new course "Foundations of Marxism-Leninism." The basic textbook for this course will be the *Brief History of the All-Union Communist Party*, first published in October, 1938, and now distributed in 8,000,000 copies. Only after completing the study of Marxism-Leninism will students take up political economy, and thereafter dialectical and historical materialism.

#### *Soviet Academy of Sciences*

The Sovnarkom having increased the number of Members of the Academy to 130, the corresponding Members to 330, there was great interest in the elections, which took place in January. There were 248 candidates for the 50 vacancies as Members, and 542 for the 100 vacancies as Corresponding Members. Among those elected Members were Emelyan Yaroslavsky (President of the Godless), A. Y. Vyshinsky (State Prosecutor), Alexis Tolstoy and Michael Sholokhov.

#### *Death of Krupskaya-Lenin*

Lenin's widow, Nadezhda Krupskaya, died in Moscow, 27 February, the day after her 70th birthday. Born in the family of a Government official in Poland, she was educated in St. Petersburg and even as a



student was actively interested in "uplift" work among the masses. About the time of her marriage, 1894, she became an active member of a secret Social-Democrat organisation, and together with her husband spent three years of exile in Siberia. The Lenins left Russia in 1901, returning during the Russo-Japanese War in 1905 to organise revolutionary action. They left again in 1907, remaining abroad until 1917. In Russia, Krupskaya took her usual very active part in the Bolshevik activities led by her husband, and at the time of her death had long been a member of the Party's Central Committee. Although she was not a Government official, she was a very energetic worker in matters pertaining to education, especially anti-religion. Since Lenin's death she has been a symbol of orthodoxy in Party matters, and her name has often been used to guarantee Stalin's compliance with Lenin's ideas. On several occasions she has intervened on behalf of Old Bolsheviks under fire from Stalin.

*Anniversary of Professor Paul Milyukov*

The attainment of his 80th year by this very notable figure in Russian history was commemorated both in Paris and by his many friends in England, with which both as a distinguished scholar and an eminent public man he has had so many life-long connections, and later his life work will also be the subject of a special lecture in the University of London. Professor Milyukov has throughout a long and arduous career stood peculiarly close both to British scholarship and to the most intimate principles of English public life, and his marvellous vitality and unruffled and persistent vigour in the advocacy of those principles is a subject of admiration to his many friends in this country.

## REVIEWS

### MUNICH AND AFTER

It is not our purpose in this *Review* to embark upon the steadily rising flood of literature devoted to the transformation of Europe in the double crisis of March and September, 1938. But it is only proper that the attention of our readers should be drawn to certain important publications from which, in our belief, an accurate estimate of events and their consequences can be formed. As regards the Austrian problem, three books deserve very special praise. In *Austria and After* (Faber & Faber, May, 1938, 335 pp., 8s. 6d. net) Dr. Franz Borkenau gives an admirable survey of the inner causes which led to Austria's downfall. Chapters on "The Climax of Austrian Civilisation," "The Fight for German Supremacy," "Liberalism and the Jewish Problem," "Anti-semitism and Nationalism," "Austro-Marxism," "Socialism versus Fascism," lead up to the final tragedy, and Dr. Borkenau is especially valuable for his psychological speculations. "The difficulties involved in the assimilation of Austria to Germany are incomparably greater than those which

hampered the assimilation of Bavaria to Prussia ". it is on this note that he closes.

Those who desire a detailed, sensational, but in all essentials accurate narrative of events, written by one of the most courageous and best-informed journalists in Central Europe, will read Mr. G. E. R. Gedye's *Fallen Bastions* (Gollancz, February, 1939, 519 pp., 7s. 6d.). The note is sometimes pitched too high, and many will be put off by the foolish practice of referring to the Prime Minister as " Monsieur J'aime-Berlin " or by interjections such as " Hoo-ray, hoo-bloody-ray!" or " My God—they did " But this is armchair criticism: how many of us who make it could ever be the same men if we had lived at first-hand through the long inferno into which Mr. Gedye saw his beloved Vienna plunged last year? The book has been lived, and its most impossible secrets are confirmed from other sources. Herr von Schuschnigg's own book, *Dreimal Oesterreich* (translated into English under the title *Farewell Austria*, Cassell), is of great interest as a psychological document but does not reveal any notable secrets. Much more important is *A Pact with Hitler* (Gollancz, March, 1939, 352 pp., 12s. 6d. net) by Herr Martin Fuchs, who was Austrian Press Attaché in Paris and therefore one of the very few initiated Austrians now free to tell the tale. Moreover, he was one of the links between Herr von Schuschnigg and Archduke Otto, whose remarkable exchange of letters during the crisis of February, 1938, is published as an appendix. Herr Fuchs was actually present at some of the highly confidential meetings of which he writes—e.g., the interviews with the Duce at Rocca della Caminata, and at Venice—and has other first-hand material at his disposal similar to that published some months ago in the *Evening Standard*, and more or less identical with the book published in German at New York by Herr Zernatto, almost the only member of the Schuschnigg Government who was able to escape abroad. Herr Fuchs has a regrettable habit—permissible to Thucydides, but not in the twentieth century—of putting soliloquies and dialogues into the mouths of leading statesmen (and notably of the Fuhrer) which merely represent the author's reading of events and can never have been actually uttered. But this blemish is too obvious to detract from those other passages which are based on intimate inside information.

The first in the Czech field—apart from Miss Elizabeth Wiskemann's admirable *Czech and German* (published for Chatham House last spring and reviewed in No. 49 of this *Review*)—was Miss Sheila Grant-Duff's *Europe and the Czechs* (Penguin, 6d.), which appeared at the height of the crisis and helped to inform public opinion, but was speedily out-distanced by events. The diplomatic history of the crisis will be found in two books from opposite sides of the Atlantic, both containing trenchant and detailed criticism of the French and British Governments, based upon first-hand documentary evidence. The first is *When there is no Peace* (Macmillan, January, 1939, \$1.75, English edition about to appear) by Hamilton Fish Armstrong, editor of *Foreign Affairs* (the famous New York

quarterly, and organ of the Council on Foreign Relations) and one of the best-informed publicists in the English-speaking world. The second is *Munich and the Dictators* (Methuen, March, 1939, 5s. net), by R. W. Seton-Watson, which is a sequel to his bigger volumes *Britain in Europe, 1789-1914* (1937) and *Britain and the Dictators* (1938). Among other books on the subject which are to appear shortly, special attention should be paid to those of Mr. C. A. Voigt, of *The Nineteenth Century* and *Manchester Guardian* (Constable), of Mr. and Mrs. Jonathan Griffin (Chatto & Windus) and of Dr. Hubert Ripka, the distinguished Czech journalist. Mr. Douglas Reed's *Disgrace Abounding* (Cape, 10s. net), is as bitter and as arresting as his earlier book entitled *Insanity Fair*, which was one of the successes of last year. It deserves inclusion here, for the sake of a chapter called "Portrait of a Gentleman," and devoted to Dr. Beneš: for here we have the full notes of two conversations with the President in December, 1937, which go to the very root of the whole matter, showing that he could have made terms with Germany, if he had not been unwise enough to trust his ally and that ally's friend. But it is necessary to protest against the superficiality of his attack on the Jews of Vienna.

A special niche has been reserved for Mr. Graham Hutton's *Danubian Destiny*, which lays special stress on the economic and strategic aspects of the Munich "settlement." Among the many points raised in a fresh and arresting manner by this writer (till recently Assistant Editor of the *Economist*) are the bearing of population upon strategy, the position of the Swiss railway routes across the Alps as a possible factor in Axis policy, the debit and credit for Germany of the Austrian Anschluss, the strategic interests of Poland at Bohumin, as explaining Poland's attitude in the crisis. He lays his finger on a point far too little considered by our public opinion: to those who ask whether Hitler is now going East or West, he answers that a simultaneous drive in both directions may be expected—"a combination of offensives in *East and West*. In the West the offensive would be diplomatically a reality but militarily a bluff: in the East it would be a reality under both heads." As he points out, Germany has already achieved "the isolation of every European country lying beyond the Denmark-Tunisia line of the Italo-German front," and is now planning, through the Spanish adventure, "to immobilise the West and roll up the map of Europe." Mr. Hutton's aim is to show that the fate of Danubian Europe is, at any rate from an economic point of view, likely to prove decisive. The book is closely argued and cannot safely be ignored.

*Alexander of Yugoslavia, Strong Man of the Balkans.* By Stephen Graham, 1938. (Cassell & Co.), 12s. 6d. net. 302 pages.

ON the jacket supplied by the publisher, but not in the text of the book (and there is no preface of any kind), the reader is informed that

"influential help has been given to the writing of this book," that Queen Marie and Prince Paul gave Mr. Graham not merely the Order of St. Sava, but "personal and hitherto secret information," and that various "Premiers and other Ministers" revealed to him "the inner history of what actually took place in Belgrade and Marseilles." What would otherwise have been dismissed by many readers as little more than an ingenious reconstruction by someone who could not possibly have known the facts from his own experience thus becomes an inspired and highly credible narrative—all the more credible because it corresponds in minutest detail with much that was already known to, or suspected by, the initiated.

The book is somewhat curiously planned. The opening chapter is a rather over-elaborated study of "Vlada the Chauffeur," the miscreant who murdered King Alexander at Marseilles; then follows an account of the tragedy, and a special chapter devoted to Kral, Vlada's cowardly accomplice: then (pp. 72—126) a biographical sketch of the King down to his establishment of the dictatorship in 1929, then a fresh diversion on the Croat terrorist leader Ante Pavelić, then a chapter called "Lonely Dictator," followed by a very detailed survey of the "international sabotage" and terrorist outrages in Croatia, culminating in Oreb's abortive plot at Zagreb and the "loan of an assassin," himself a Macedonian, to the Croat exiles in Italy. The last four chapters recount the developments in Yugoslavia after the murder and the gross scandals of the Aix Trial. Despite this completely unsystematic treatment the individual sections are admirably written, and the subject one which only a dullard (and no one will ever apply that word to Mr. Graham) could make dull.

His reading of the King's character and motives is very fair and very sympathetic; all the more impressive, then, is his frank admission that as late as 1932 Alexander "dwelt in a fool's paradise" and believed in the futile Constitution which he had illegally promulgated in 1931 (p. 160), and that before he died he had come to recognise that "the dictatorship and the one-party régime had been a failure since their inception." The authority of M. Jevtić, then Foreign Minister and afterwards Premier, is quoted in proof of the statement that "the draft of an amended Constitution" had been before the King "for some time," and that "he had at last decided to yield to the advice of most of the dissidents and have a federal kingdom" (p. 47). This is all the more interesting in view of the recent tendency in official Yugoslav circles to argue that Constitutional revision, especially in a federal sense, would run counter to the late King's wishes. Emphasis should also be laid on the statement that the King intended on his return from France to recognise Soviet Russia (p. 48)—a step which his successors, in their anti-Communist obsession, have hitherto avoided. Mr. Graham is quite right (p. 189) in stating that under Prince Paul "Yugoslav foreign policy was deflected into a different course."

It is impossible to take exception either to the general trend, or to the detailed treatment, but here and there Mr. Graham commits himself to very curious judgments. No one acquainted with the position in 1918-19 in the new State could possibly admit that "only immediate occupation by the Serb Army prevented the setting up of a Soviet régime" (p. 103): the danger came from Italian invasion, not from Bolshevik infection. Equally open to challenge is the statement that the Croat "masses were more ready for Marxism than for Democracy" (p. 108). The answer is to be found in the absolute hold over the peasant masses by Radić Pribičević and now Maček, in spite of every temptation to plunge into extremes as the result of Belgrade's attitude. And again, to say that Maček has "no link with the village and the peasant" (p. 158), is to show a strange ignorance of the Croat leader. Nor is it easy to understand why such an understanding writer as Mr. Graham should have had the strange idea of comparing Alexander with Lincoln, Wolfe and Gordon (p. 72); personally, I fail to see the remotest resemblance. Moreover, real protest must be entered against the statement that "Serbia's war exploits only became famous after the war" (p. 90). In reality, those exploits rang through this country in 1915 and caused a memorable response in money and practical assistance, the Press was full of the retreat across Albania, and the doctors and nurses and others who flocked to the aid of Serbia spread the interest far and wide.

The most interesting feature of the book is the absolute openness with which—at long last—the story of Italy's encouragement of Croat terrorism is recounted, and in particular the assistance rendered to Ante Pavelić in such camps as Borgotaro, the arming of the "Ussaši" rebels, and the long series of bomb outrages leading to the fiasco of Zagreb in January, 1934, and the final achievement at Marseilles in October. Already on page 3 he writes, "The King's death was required. Petty outrages such as blowing up passenger trains did not satisfy Pavelić's employers. They threatened withdrawal of financial support if a capital crime was not achieved." In the Oreb trial, he claims, "it was shown conclusively that the Italians were ready to pay for the murder of the King" (p. 33). In this connection it is most regrettable that no proper report of the sensational evidence at this trial has ever been published abroad.

On p. 139 there is an open reference to alleged financial relations between Pavelić's agent Peršec and the latter's mistress Jelka Pogorelec, and the Italian Press Attaché in Vienna, Signor Moreale—"at that time the agent for financing the Heimwehr." There are various references to the Croat propagandists working in Vienna and issuing periodicals and news-sheets, at very considerable expense, in German, French and English; it is a pity that we are not told more about where the money came from, which "flowed like water for Pavelić and his associates."

It is made abundantly clear that the Duce believed in the possibility of disintegrating the Yugoslav State by exploiting Croat discontent and

only convinced himself of his mistake when the murder produced a spontaneous and universal outburst of anger and regret, and separatism proved to be almost non-existent. Mr. Graham affirms (p. 203) that if the Zagreb murder plot had succeeded, "it was the intention of those Italians who were instructing Pavelić to allow the blame to attach to Hungary." And sure enough, when the Marseilles plot eventually succeeded, the blame was thrown not upon Italy, but upon Hungary, who had allowed a training camp at Janka Puszta, on the Yugoslav-Hungarian border, and had helped to smuggle literature, weapons and men into Yugoslavia, but had no direct share in any of the plots. M. Jevtić allowed himself to be intimidated or manœuvred into suppressing the Italian half of the incriminating *dossier* at Geneva, and concentrating on the much less important Hungarian half. Mr. Graham is absolutely right in condemning the mistaken and insincere attitude of the Powers. "It was a vital moment for a thorough testing of the authority of the League. The League should have been presented with the whole case, and world opinion mobilised against international sabotage. France was shortsighted, for very soon her territory was secretly invaded by foreign agents storing bombs and arms for a Fascist rising, blowing up trains and houses. Britain was shortsighted and was soon, through the League, inviting an unwilling Yugoslavia to impose sanctions upon a Power she had been persuaded to forgive." (p. 251). Fairness compels us to add that Belgrade was being hoist with its own petard: for its attitude to the question of responsibility for the Sarajevo murder and of post-war glorification of Princip and his fellow murderers had been extremely—remiss, not to use a stronger term. After the shameful conspiracy of silence at Geneva, the highly questionable proceedings at the trial of the accomplices of Pavelić and the dead "Vlada" seem to follow logically, but none the less make unpleasant reading.

Out of a book of absorbing though uneven interest I cannot resist quoting a phrase worthy of remembrance in these days of contending radio champions. "A curious effect of propaganda is that it sometimes convinces those who write it instead of those for whom it is designed" (p. 171)—this *à propos* of Pavelić's grotesque misjudgment of the situation in Croatia and the support on which he might count there.

R. W. SETON-WATSON.

*Anglja I Polska w Latach 1860-65* (England and Poland 1860-65). By Henryk Wereszycki, Lwow 1934, pp. 207.

THIS interesting contribution to Anglo-Polish relations in the 19th century is part of Vol. X of the series of Historical Studies, Part II, now being published by the Scientific Society in Lwow, as a general Archivum. At last we have one of the younger historians getting seriously to work in one little corner of a field that has as yet been hardly explored at all—that of the relations between Poland and England down the ages. Not

that these were ever very close, though there were important trade connections via Danzig in the old days; but that, when they did liven up, they left a lot of useful materials for the historian.

When the Poles revolted in 1830-31 they occupied the attention of the Tsar and kept him from his plan of sending an army to the west to put down the Belgian movement for freedom that changed the map of Europe on the lower Rhine. Their second revolt, a generation later, was ill-starred, if only because they counted on the French Emperor's help, just as they had enjoyed that of his grandfather half a century earlier. And the person who was most suspicious of Napoleon III in Europe was Palmerston. Hence the slightness of chance of getting anything but Platonic good-will and the vaguest of promises from Whitehall, even though the Poles had very able people in England, and got their case before the public as never before. To make matters worse, England's queen had sentimental attachments for Prussia, and England's merchants growing trade relations with Russia. It was easy, then, for them to accept the obvious parallel: Poland was Russia's Ireland—and basta. Dr. Wereszycki has got to know the source-materials in the British Museum and the Public Record Office, as well as the speeches in Hansard, and MSS materials elsewhere. He also worked in the archives of the Foreign Office in Paris. He regrets the detachment of the English, but does not blame them for not starting a crusade on the Vistula.

Perhaps his most interesting chapter is the one entitled "Polish Propaganda in England," which reminds us that there was this troublesome thing long before the world war. (On the British Press of those years J. H. Harley has written at length in Nos 46 and 47 of the *Slavonic and East European Review*.) Dr. Wereszycki brings out a number of interesting facts: (i) that the Polish leaders, Prince Czartoryski, of the Hotel Lambert in Paris, and General Zamoyski, were themselves far from agreed as to what should be asked for, or what was to be done, (ii) that then, as many times since, England and France waited, each for the other to take the lead, (iii) that the whole English view was a very realistic one. Incidentally, it is notable that these efforts for Poland were the last to be made by that left-over from the emigration of 1831, the Hotel Lambert.

W. J. ROSE.

*Literatura serbsko-lużycka* (Serb-Lusatian Literature). By Józef Gołąbek  
Instytut śląski, Seria Pamiętników Instytutu śląskiego V. Katowice  
1938. 269 pp. 62ł.)

THIS well-written and excellently-printed book furnishes a useful introduction, for anyone who can read Polish, to the study of one of the lesser Slavonic literatures (and for those who cannot there is an eight-page résumé in French giving at any rate the bare bones of the matter.) It is a literature which, if it has as yet produced nothing to compare with the great works of world literature, is nevertheless, like other minor litera-

tures, productive of food for thought in the way in which it mirrors *in parvo* the course of European civilisation. As Dr. J. Páta, the Czech authority on matters Lusatian, says in his review of this book (*Slovanský Přehled*, 1938, No. 9), "the Reformation, humanism, rationalism, pietism, romanticism, realism, new trends of thought during the World War and after, all are reflected . . . in both literatures." The last words refer to the thought-provoking fact that Lusatian, with its hundred thousand or so speakers forming a Slavonic island in the German sea, has, besides numerous spoken dialects, two distinct literary languages differing considerably one from the other: Upper Lusatian, which to a certain extent resembles Czech, and Lower Lusatian, which has numerous points in common with Polish. Páta takes exception to Gołabek's "uncritical acceptance" of the Polish thesis that Lusatian "belongs to the Lechic group, i.e. that it is not an independent branch of Slavonic." Anyone who considers, for instance, the (Upper Lusatian) Oath of the Burghers of Bautzen (15th century) beginning "Ja přísaham Bohu a našemu nejnadnjějšemu knjezu . . ." (quoted in part at page 31, and given in full in Berneker's *Slavische Chrestomathie*) might be inclined to conclude that this branch at least of Lusatian could equally well be attached to the Czecho-Slovak group. (Then again, there are those who claim that Slovak resembles Polish more than it does Czech! Was any branch of philology ever so influenced by political considerations as is Slavonic?) To quote the author's final paragraph, Lusatian literature "is not excessively original or rich, but for several centuries it has sufficed for the maintenance of nationality, and this task it has well performed. We have had occasion to observe that this literature is not decadent, but on the contrary continually developing and perfecting itself, acquiring power and independence; and all this permits us to hope that thanks to its constant evolution it will continue to animate the people's will to live."

The present writer is not qualified to estimate with what completeness and adequacy Dr. Gołabek's book traces the history of the Lusatian literatures. He must content himself with noting that Dr. Páta, with certain reservations, approves, and with mentioning a few points in the book which struck him, particularly from the English point of view.

The two introductory chapters give an interesting account of the Slavs on the Oder and the Elbe and the early history of the Lusatians. We read here that in 1019 the Obodrytes under Mstislav were attacked and defeated by Canute the Great. (And that a later ruler of the Obodrytes was "Gotschalk, son of Przybigniew"; these two names speak volumes). An 8th-century prince of the Lusatians, Młoduch, provoked in the *Chronicon Moissiacense* (806) the pun "rex superbus, qui regnabat in Suurbis." In 1136 the Lower Lusatians fell under the power of the Wettins, who ruled them for 44 years.

The direct influence of English literature is only mentioned in the case of Thomson, whose "Seasons" were imitated by Handrij Zejleř,



and (of course ?) Shakespeare. Jakub Bart-Ćišinski gave versions of Shakespeare in his lyric cycle, *W ścieżce samoce*; Józef Nowak's drama *Posledni kral* was based on Shakespeare and Schiller, and Jan Bohuđer Pjech produced, besides a translation via the German of six of the Sonnets under the pseudonym Jan z Lipy, apparently listed by Gołabek as a separate writer, a version of "Julius Cæsar" which, made in 1857, was not printed till 1914:

("Wy přeceljo a lubi Romjenjo,  
Nětk khilće wuši ke mni, pos'chajće,  
Pohrjeb chcū zhotowaći Cæsarjej,  
Nic khwalě jehō," etc.)

The book is completed by an exhaustive index and a most useful list of Lusatian place-names mentioned in the text together with the German equivalents (Hródk—Spremberg, Njeznarowy—Eisenrode, etc.) Incidentally, it is interesting to note that of late years some of the more Slavonic-sounding German names have been changed, e.g. Dubring becoming Eichenau, Wendisch Ossig—Warnsdorf, Horka—Querfurt, the hills Bieleboh and Zschorneboh—Huhwald and Schleifberg. W. A. MORISON.

*Najnowsza Polska Twórczość Literacka* (The Newest Polish Literature).

By Kazimierz Czachowski, Lwow, 1938, pp. 274, illustrated.

THE author of this useful little hand-book, who has written for the *Review* the paper on K. H. Rostworowski, has made himself a name among present-day literary critics in Poland. Not long since he published a larger work on post-war literature, and here we have a survey of the younger generation of novelists and poets, some better and some worse. It is written in a pleasing style, and will be found a most useful *vade mecum* for those who want to see just what is being read in a part of the world they know too little about.

Some four-score writers are given a longer mention, and many others a brief one. The present notice proposes to draw attention to one kind of novel only, what is generally called the historical tale. But first, two general comments. It is a striking fact that in the new Poland women have run an even race with the men in literary production, and may even be said to have outdistanced them. Further, both they and the men seem to have been caught by the fashion of writing not books, but cycles of books. They come in threes or even fives, but do represent organic wholes—after the manner of the Forsyte Saga. And one must admit that, if the time can be found to read them, they do both entertain and edify.

Perhaps it was inevitable that the winning of political liberties would drive the younger generation to study the past, particularly the immediate past out of which has come the present. For that reason the huge group of tales *Days and Nights* by Marya Dąbrowska, a notable study of the life of the peasant folk (of which for some odd reason

Czachowski makes no mention), or the shorter work *The Krauses and Others*, a picture of the life in southern Poland in the 'sixties and 'seventies. by Hermína Naglerowa, or *The Salt of the Earth*, by Jozef Wittlin, of which the first volume gives us a picture of the life led by an ordinary infantryman in the Great War, are all helpful insights into the doings and thinking of the people who carry the burden of everyday living. The single volume *The Foreigner*, by Marya Kuncewiczowa, is a poignant example of how the fates deal with innocent people—the heroine was unable to be a good "Russian" in the old days, because she was born and brought up a Pole, nor a good enough Pole when she returned "home" under the new order.

Village life, peasant conditions in general, absorb the attention of some of the best of the younger men, as well as some of the weaker brethren. The influence of Reymont and Zeromski can be seen, but also the will to depart from that tradition and open up new lines. In the tales of Jan Wiktor the influence of Orkan is to the fore—in general he is moved by the fearful poverty of the highland areas of southern Poland. Ewa Gojawiczynska turned from a fine study of the life of the miners in Upper Silesia to study the conditions of work and play of the poorer women-workers of Warsaw—*The Girls from Nowolipki*. Kaden-Bandrowski, secretary of the Polish Academy of Letters, has also gone to the life of the miners that he knows so well for the setting of his *Black Wings*.

Two writers of eminence, the poet Iwaszkiewicz and the authoress Kossk-Szczucka, went right back to the Crusades for the setting of notable tales; and the former has now a new tale, *The Mill on the Utrata*, to his credit. One other name must be added—that of Sergius Piasecki, who wrote his first work while serving a sentence for banditry, and has since stepped into the front rank of novelists. Clearly there is no lack of talent in the new Poland and it is to be hoped that some of the good things will find English publishers soon.

W. J. ROSE.

*Finland.* By J. Hampden Jackson, 1938. (George Allen & Unwin), 8s. 6d. net. 243 pages.

FINLAND has always attracted a certain amount of sympathy and interest in this country, especially in the bad days of would-be Russification, and such charming sketches as those of the late Mrs. Hyndman (Rosalind Travers) and Mr. MacCallum Scott were the result. But Mr. Hampden Jackson is the first to produce a book which is at once readable and scholarly and combines a reliable historical survey (from the days of the Swedish conquest and the Reformation to the collapse of Tsarism and the emergence of an independent Republic from the chaos of civil war and Bolshevik menace) with a careful study of Finnish economic and social conditions since the war.

The opening phrase of Chapter VII gives the clue to Mr. Jackson's outlook: "It is always surprising to find how little is settled by the

realisation of a political ideal. Finland had achieved her independence, but by that very fact many of the problems which had vexed her in the past were intensified." He then proceeds to deal with the language controversy between Finn and Swede, the land question and the extension of "agricultural productivity," the great achievements of the co-operative movement, the prohibition experiment, the dangerous developments from the Lapuan movement after 1930, the return of political calm as the process of economic recovery grew more marked, and the *rapprochement* with Sweden as the pivot of Baltic safety. The last two chapters are devoted to "The Condition of the People" and "Civilisation and Culture": the feminist problem, nowhere so fully developed, is linked up with education and the falling birthrate. Finland's contributions to architecture and music are duly stressed, though with a brevity which the reader regrets, and a concluding note on the religious position leaves us with the dictum that "nationalism has saved Finnish culture from extinction."

R.W.S.-W.

On 23 January, 1939, the School of Slavonic and East European Studies entered its permanent home in the central building of the University of London, facing the British Museum. These quarters, which are spacious and beautifully decorated, admit of further extension if required. Readers of Professor Seton-Watson's article in our last number on the origins of the School are reminded that its inaugurator and first teacher was Professor Thomas G. Masaryk, then an exile and proscrip living in London. From this exile he returned to his native country, which his efforts had done so much to liberate from a foreign yoke, to be its first President. Masaryk, in his wisdom, must have been struck during his exile by the almost complete ignorance in the Western countries, not only of his own Czechoslovakia, but of the whole of Eastern Europe. The Government of the new Republic, on the death of M. Ernest Denis, the most distinguished French scholar in this subject, purchased his house in the rue Michelet, Paris, and converted it into a permanent home for Slavonic Studies. Later on, with the same object, it offered a sum of about £40,000 to the University of London for what is now the permanent home of our School. Both the building, and therefore the instalments, were necessarily delayed till the University should be able to comprise the scheme within its whole plan of building, and it was as lately as the spring of 1938, when the clouds had already gathered around Czechoslovakia, that the third instalment was paid, carrying the total up to £26,000. The University of London, fully realising the difficulties of the Czechoslovak Government, decided to go forward with the plan, irrespective of whether the sum were completed by the donors, in the hope of supplementing it if necessary from other sources. These are the circumstances in which the School has entered its new home. Munich

had already happened ; and not long after our entry came the news overnight of the dastardly seizure of Czechoslovakia by the German Reich. On that day all our curtains were drawn. But we can feel that in our little fortress of learning there is still an independent Czechoslovakia, and our large lecture hall will always bear the name of Thomas Masaryk. The lot of the smaller Slavonic peoples has always been hard. Wholly or in part they have for long periods been deprived of their independence; but even under foreign rule the peoples themselves were unbreakable. When Poland had been brutally removed from the map of Europe by three plundering Empires, the Chair of Polish, held in the university of Paris by Adam Mickiewicz, was the very focus of the intellectual and spiritual life of the Polish people. The Czechoslovak nation, which knew how to emerge from even longer centuries of foreign rule, will, we believe, surely write its name again on the map of Europe.

---

#### MEMBERSHIP OF THE SCHOOL

The following have been recently elected Members of the School:—

ALLEN, W. E. D. Author of *The Turks in Europe ; the Caucasus ; Beled-es-Siba ; Sketches and Essays of Travel and History ; A History of the Georgian People*.

BOYANUS, Semen Publications: (with Muller) *English-Russian and Russian-English Dictionaries ; A Manual of Russian Pronunciation*, (with N. B. Jopson) *Spoken Russian*

CARR, Edward Hallett, C.B.E. Author of *Dostoyevsky ; The Romantic Exiles , Karl Marx . A Study in Fanaticism* ; articles in various periodicals.

ELTON, Oliver. Publications: *Eugeny Onegin* (translated into English), fairy tales of Pushkin and other Russian poems (translated) ; as well as standard books on English literature.

HILL, Elizabeth M. Translated and edited (with Doris Mudie) *The Letters of Dostoyevsky to his Wife ; Letters of Lenin*.

JOPSON, Norman Brooke. Publications: *The Distribution and Inter-relations of the Slavonic Peoples and Languages* : (with S. Boyanus)

*Spoken Russian* ; translations from various languages in the *Slavonic and East European Review*.

KNOX, Major-Gen. Sir Alfred. Author of *With the Russian Army*, 1914-17 (2 vols.). (This book has been much utilised by later historians).

MACARTNEY, Carlile Aylmer. Publications: *The Social Revolution in Austria* ; *The Magyars in the Ninth Century* ; *National States and National Minorities , Hungary* ; *Hungary and her Successors , The Treaty of Trianon and its Consequences*.

MALINOWSKI, Bronislaw. Publications: *The Family Among the Australian Aborigines* ; *Argonauts of the Western Pacific , Myth in Primitive Psychology, etc., etc.*

MINORSKY, Vladimir. Translated and edited Hudūd Al-'Alam : " The Regions of the World " : A Persian Geography, 372A.H.-982 A.D.

RICE, David Talbot. Publications: *Byzantine Glazed Pottery* ; *Handbook of Byzantine Art* ; (with R. Byron) *The Birth of Western Painting* ; Ed. *Russian Art*.

STRUVE, Gleb. Publications: *Soviet Russian Literature* ; and many literary articles in the *Slavonic Review* and other periodicals.

SUBOTIC, Dragutin. Publication: *Yugoslav Popular Ballads*.

SUMNER, Benedict Humphrey. Publication: *Russia in the Balkans*, 1870-1880.

WISKEMANN, Elizabeth. Author of: *Czechs and Germans : a Study of the Struggle in the Historical Provinces in Bohemia and Moravia*.

After conferring with its American colleagues, and in particular with the contributing American editors of this *Review*, the School decided that in future, American scholars will rank not as Corresponding Members but as full Members of the School. The list of Members will be given in two sections, British and American. In connection with the entry of the School into its permanent home, a number of additions, some of them very belated, will be made to the list of American Members.

---

The entry into the home is the realisation of a long-cherished dream. Situated just beside the British Museum, which is second to no Slavonic library in Western Europe, and with entrance by a back door in the Museum, the School will be in the closest neighbourhood of the University Library, the School of Oriental Studies, and the Institute of Historical Research, with all of which it has long been in the closest co-operation. These institutions will together be able to offer the study of the lesser-known peoples of Europe, Asia and Africa, their philology, literature, history and economics, as far as the Pacific.

## THE AMERICAN QUARTERLY ON THE SOVIET UNION

**The Periodical of Authoritative Information on the Soviet Union**

### ARTICLES APPEARING IN FORTHCOMING ISSUE:

Development of Soviet Philosophy	- - - -	John M. Somerville
Some Problems of Mediæval Archæology at Kiev	- - - -	Samuel H. Cross
Soviet Treatment of Juvenile Delinquency	- - - -	Nathan Berman
Adult Education	- - - -	William H. Johnson
Serge Prokofieff	- - - -	Nicolas Slonimsky

*Subscribe to :*

**THE AMERICAN QUARTERLY ON THE SOVIET UNION  
and its semi-monthly supplement**

**THE BULLETIN ON THE SOVIET UNION  
providing information and background on  
current developments in the U.S.S.R.**

Joint subscription price — only \$2.50 (foreign)

*Published by*

**THE AMERICAN RUSSIAN INSTITUTE  
56 West 45th Street, New York, N.Y.**

# FOREIGN AFFAIRS

*An American Quarterly Review*  
Hamilton Fish Armstrong—Editor



THE world's leading statesmen, economists and financial authorities write for FOREIGN AFFAIRS. They keep the readers of this important American review informed about the basic causes of the great events which today are making history.

## CONTENTS OF THE APRIL ISSUE.

WILL HITLER SAVE DEMOCRACY?.....	<i>Anonymous</i>
OUR NEW LONG SHADOW.....	<i>Hanson W. Baldwin</i>
JAPAN AT WAR.....	<i>William Henry Chamberlin</i>
THE TWO "G's": GESTAPO AND GPU.....	<i>Balticus</i>
THE AMERICAN FAR NORTH.....	<i>Vilhjalmur Stefansson</i>
GERMAN ECONOMIC TENSION: CAUSES AND RESULTS .....	<i>Graham Hutton</i>
THE REICHSWEHR TODAY.....	<i>Herbert Rosinski</i>
ITALIAN AUTARCHY IN PRACTICE.....	<i>Antonio Benni</i>
THE GREAT BOLSHIEVIK CLEANSING.....	<i>Joseph Barnes</i>
MACHIAVELLI AND MACHIAVELLISM.....	<i>Guglielmo Ferrero</i>
HAS GOLD A FUTURE?.....	<i>Frank D. Graham and Charles R. Whittlesey</i>
HUNGARY IN THE GERMAN ORBIT.....	<i>George M. Katona</i>
DENMARK'S PRECARIOUS NEUTRALITY.....	<i>Gunnar Leistikow</i>
CHILE MOVES LEFT.....	<i>Clarence H. Haring</i>
THE BURMA ROAD.....	<i>Walter H. Mallory</i>
RECENT BOOKS ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS	<i>Robert Gale Woolbert</i>
SOURCE MATERIAL.....	<i>Denys P. Myers</i>

—also the usual maps and notes, bibliography of new books in the international field, index of treaties and trade agreements, etc.

Subscriptions: \$5 a year post free to any address.

Use form below for special offer.

TEAR OFF HERE

FOREIGN AFFAIRS, 45 East 65th St., New York.

Please enter me for a year's subscription and include, without charge, the issue described above. I enclose \$5 in payment.

Name .....

Street .....

City ..... April.